

JPRS-TAC-86-009

16 January 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

16 January 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

Mid-December Soviet Comments on Western European SDI Participation	
(Various sources, various dates).....	1
Consequences Analyzed, by Igor Surguchev	1
NATO Secretary General 'Advertising'	2
Statement Given to UK	3
IZVESTIYA Examines Consequences, by Ye. Bovkun	3
FRG Makes 'Dangerous Choice'	5
PRAVDA: FRG Backing 'Fatal Step'	7
PRAVDA's Yakhontiv	10
TASS' Aksyonov	10
Communists, Others Condemn FRG	11
Shevardnadze, FRG Ambassador	12
FRG, Italian Participation Viewed	13
'Serious' French, FRG Differences	13
Mitterrand Confirms Rejection	14
France's Refusal Examined	14
Attempts To Drag Turkey Into Plans	16
Norwegian Eureka Participation	16
Possible Soviet Countermeasures to SDI Specified	
(V. Morozov; Moscow TRUD, 21 Dec 85).....	18
USSR's 'Top Priority' Program Participants Discuss SDI	
(Moscow in English to North America, 23 Dec 85).....	21
USSR's Bolshakov Examines Motivations in SDI Program	
(Moscow Domestic Service, 19 Dec 85).....	26
USSR: Japan Told U.S. Trade Concessions Depend on SDI Role	
(Moscow IZVESTIYA, 15 Dec 85).....	29

Soviet Academician Aleksandrov Discusses Use of Space (A.P. Aleksandrov; Moscow PRAVDA, 20 Dec 85).....	31
--	----

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

Soviet Comments on Pentagon Year-End INF Deployment Statement (Various sources, various dates).....	34
Statement Noted	34
Contradicts Geneva Statement	34
Remains 'Acute' Issue, by I. Fedorov	35
U.S. Introduces 'Instability'	36
FRG Turned Into 'Powder Keg'	37

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR: U.S. CW Actions Run Contrary to Summit Results (Vadim Biryukov; Moscow Domestic Service, 28 Dec 85).....	39
Soviet Journal Interviews Bundestag Official on CW-Free Zone (Karsten Voigt Interview; Moscow NEW TIMES, No 45, Nov 85)..	40
Soviet Commentary on U.S. Binary Development Plans for Europe (Yu. Romantsov; Yerevan KOMMUNIST, 17 Oct 85).....	43

RELATED ISSUES

Gorbachev Speech to Diplomatic Envoys Reported (Moscow TASS, 27 Dec 85).....	46
Hopes for U.S.-Soviet Affairs in Peace Year Voiced (Vadim Zagladin; Moscow World Service, 1 Jan 85).....	48
PRAVDA 29 December Review of Week's International Events (Moscow PRAVDA, 29 Dec 85).....	49
Moscow TV's 28 Dec 'Studio 9' Program (Moscow Television Service, 28 Dec 85).....	53
USSR's UN Delegate Addresses Press Conference (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 26 Dec 85).....	55
40th UN General Assembly Session Viewed by PRAVDA (P. Vladimirovskiy; Moscow PRAVDA, 30 Dec 85).....	57
PRAVDA Report on Romanian Foreign Minister's Visit to USSR (Moscow PRAVDA, 29 Dec 85).....	60

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MID-DECEMBER SOVIET COMMENTS ON WESTERN EUROPEAN SDI PARTICIPATION

Consequences Analyzed

LD222004 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 20 Dec 85

[Commentary by international affairs journalist Igor Surguchev]

[Text] As has already been reported, the FRG Government has taken a decision on the country's participation in the U.S. "star wars" program. Announcing this decision, Ost, the Bonn cabinet spokesman, said U.S.-FRG talks will begin next month, aimed at concluding an agreement in which specific questions of the FRG's participation in implementing the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative will be stipulated. In his words, Bonn hopes that the official signing of such an agreement will take place not later than March next year. In this way the FRG will become the second country after Britain to decide to join in the U.S. plans to militarize space. A commentary by international affairs journalist Igor Surguchev is devoted to this theme:

Let me remind you that the United States officially invited 18 states to participate in its "star wars" program. But on the whole, those invited did not respond quickly, and that is understandable if one takes into account the adventurist nature of Washington's plan, its extremely destabilizing effect on the correlation of strategic forces in the world, as well as the severe criticism to which it was subjected both in public, political, and scientific circles. However, those over the ocean who gave birth to the idea of "star wars" and who gave their blessing to it, seeing in it a means of achieving military superiority over the socialist world, used a whole arsenal of political and propagandist pressure, in order to talk around the waverers and doubters.

In March this year, Washington took the unprecedented step of demanding, in the form of an ultimatum, that the United States' NATO allies reply to the U.S. invitation within 60 days. This ultimatum, which betrayed the strong irritation of the militarists over the ocean, did indeed speed up the official reaction by several countries to the call for participation in SDI. But the nature of their reactions were disappointing for the White House. One after another, six states -- France, Norway, Greece, Denmark, Australia, and Canada -- announced their refusal to take part on a governmental level in implementing the "star wars" plans. Only the most loyal U.S. allies in Western Europe -- Britain, and now West Germany -- made their senior partner in the NATO bloc happy by agreeing to join in the U.S. space adventure. To be frank, 2 countries out of the 18 invited, this is, God knows, no achievement for the champions of the transfer of the arms race into space. True, it is rumored that Rome and Tokyo will follow London and Bonn, but neither Italy nor Japan have yet made a final choice, not officially anyway.

All this shows that despite the striving to please Washington, to show solidarity with it, despite U.S. pressure and promises of big profits to foreign firms who agree to take part in developments within the SDI program, the governments of many states that are allies of the United States, are not burning with desire to get mixed up in the transatlantic venture. Understanding the truly unforeseeable consequences, which are extremely dangerous for the whole of mankind, of deploying strike weapons in space, as well as the very broad opposition in the world to space war plans, also hold them back. As far as the authorities of Great Britain and the FRG are concerned, they rejected all these important considerations of principle and gave in to U.S. pressure, for the sake of notorious Atlantic solidarity, and together with Washington, are taking upon themselves the serious responsibility for the fate of the world and of their own peoples.

This responsibility is in no way lessened by virtue of the fact that on the banks of the Thames and the Rhine, they are pretending that agreement to participate in SDI means only participation in innocent, scientific research work, and that it is allegedly not a question of creating a system of space weapons. To whom is it not clear, all this is just a fable for simpletons, a clumsy attempt to conceal the truth.

The Soviet Union, as well as "star wars" critics abroad, using weighty, irrefutable arguments, have repeatedly pointed out that research within the SDI framework is being carried out not for the sake of research, but in the interests of using space for military ends. As was stressed at the press conference, which took place on 18 December in Moscow, "star wars" plans undoubtedly undermine the foundation of strategic stability, and gives rise, in certain circles in the West, to political and military illusions on the possibility of getting out of the nuclear stalemate, of waging war and achieving victory. That is why SDI is an extremely dangerous and aggressive undertaking. It must also be emphasized that it is the main obstacle on the road to a radical reduction of the United States' and the USSR's nuclear arsenals.

To disregard these circumstances is to disregard the will of peoples for peace, disarmament, and detente. In acting precisely in this way, Washington, London, and Bonn are again giving the world public the chance of seeing where the threat to peace really comes from.

NATO Secretary General 'Advertising'

LD210950 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2015 GMT 20 Dec 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Kudrin]

[Text] We all favor peace. Who do you think this good phrase belongs to? To NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington. He uttered it at the Royal College of London. Unfortunately, he said nothing concrete about NATO's contribution to the cause of peace, nor could he do so as you yourselves understand. Yet listeners would have undoubtedly been interested in how ideas uttered at the Geneva negotiations are being implemented and in what the Lord himself thinks about the moratorium on banning nuclear explosions [as heard] declared by the Soviet side at the very beginning of August, and about the other Soviet peace initiatives. Instead of that, Carrington engaged in advertising the "star wars" program and expressed extreme regret that the Soviet approach to the Strategic Defense Initiative shows no attempt to smooth the sharp corners.

However, our country's position has been and remains immutable: We are against transferring the nuclear arms race into space. It is the United States, Britain, and the FRG who are preparing for "star wars" and who have increased the number of sharp corners.

Statement Given to UK

LD231853 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 23 Dec 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; announcer-read report]

[Text] At the USSR Foreign Ministry today the British ambassador to Moscow was given a statement in connection with the memorandum signed between Great Britain and the United States in December of this year on British participation in the American Strategic Defense Initiative, or SDI, which is intended to create a large-scale system of antimissile defense with parts based in space, despite the provisions of the Soviet-American Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty signed in 1972.

As is known, this is a matter not of defense but of increasing offensive capacity, of attempts to gain military supremacy. The inclusion of Great Britain in the SDI, the statement says, contradicts the affirmations by the British government about its attachment to the aims of preventing the arms race in space and ending it on earth, confirmed at the highest level in Geneva. The importance of the resolution of this great task was stressed, and the hope was expressed that the British leadership will confirm with practical actions its statements in favour of limiting the arms race and strengthening strategic stability.

IZVESTIYA Examines Consequences

PM181121 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by own correspondent Ye. Bovkun: "Rejecting the Path of Truth"]

[Text] Bonn -- The more firmly that ideas of important fundamental accords between the Soviet Union and the United States take root in the consciousness of West Germans, the more alarming the official Bonn circles' attitude toward specific issues of foreign policy connected with Geneva begins to look. Washington's "Strategic Defense Initiative" is the main thing preventing Bonn from assessing soberly the international situation which has taken shape since Geneva.

The ruling coalition has, as a whole, assessed the results of the summit meeting positively although it has been unable to display realism in analyzing the situation in the world which ultimately led the U.S. president to Geneva. The formula in which the federal government expressed its assessment of the results of the dialogue was thought up by A. Dregger and H. Kohl. In a somewhat truncated form it reads as follows: The deployment of U.S. missiles in the FRG and the United States' "staunchness" on the question of SDI "paved the way" to Geneva. That is why "a new ice age" has not come.

Following this dubious thesis, Bonn set about implementing the plans to associate the FRG to Washington's so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative." The question has in fact already been decided in advance, it is merely a question of the form of the association and the choice of moment.

Of course, matters have not proceeded smoothly. The group of the most bellicose Christian Democrat politicians around Dregger, Todenhoefer, Hupka, and Czaja, who fiercely defend the plan to take part in "star wars," has been popularly dubbed the "steel helmet" (that used to be the name of the organization of Hitler's thugs).

The "steel helmet" in the ranks of the ruling coalition is opposed by the "Genscherists" -- a group of moderates who are cautious about Reagan's "defense initiative." They rightly suspect that participation in SDI will not bring the FRG the promised gain in terms of technology but will merely be an additional burden on the economy and will create security problems. That is why the "Genscherists" headed by FRG Foreign Minister Genscher are urging the government to keep its distance from SDI.

Distrust in the "star wars" program is borne out by the hearings in the Bundstag on the SDI question with the participation of competent specialists. Harmony was not successfully achieved. Half the experts resolutely opposed the deployment of an ABM system in space.

The powerful propaganda launched by the federal government on all stories of the FRG public edifice and the constant pressure from across the ocean have done their work. They have instilled in some people the idea of the theoretical attractiveness of the U.S. "space umbrella." Nonetheless arguments in favor of SDI put into circulation from government circles are failing to meet with understanding among the broad public. How, indeed, should one treat official Bonn's arguments that the fundamental motive for the FRG's participation in SDI is the desire "to exert as much influence as possible" on the project? It is hard to think up a more unconvincing argument.

As though the West German public is unaware that Washington in general is disinclined to take account of its partners. Bonn once set about "exerting influence" on the U.S. line on the question of deploying U.S. "Pershings" and cruise missiles in West Europe. Everyone remembers how that ended. The FRG's territory is literally stuffed with first-strike nuclear weapons and the level of its security has not increased but, on the contrary, has declined.

Defending the plans to associate the FRG to the U.S. "star wars" program, right-wing Christian democrat politicians cite the fact that Bonn's "influence" on this program is "advantageous" to the Soviet Union because work on the SDI program is envisaged "strictly within the framework of the ABM Treaty" -- a strange opinion, to say the least. It turns out that by taking part in the SDI project, which deliberately contradicts the interests of the security of all peoples, it is possible almost to do a good turn to our country, against which the Transatlantic "space shield" is totally unconvincing. The plans to militarize space which are arriving from across the ocean are -- and this is universally recognized -- a blatant violation of this treaty.

For doubters the Bonn leaders have kept in reserve a very hackneyed "argument." Agreement on FRG firms' participation in SDI, it is asserted on the Rhine, would not mean contributing to the creation of an actual system of space-based weapons, it is merely a case of the program's "scientific stage." The far-fetched nature of references to the "scientific nature" of the developments launched across the ocean was long since exposed. Even the United States has ceased to resort to this reassuring method. But in the FRG it is still current.

On encountering this "argument," many politicians are expressing growing doubts as to the expediency of the FRG's participation in SDI. The Free Democratic Party [FDP] formulated its position even before Geneva, at a session of its board in Neuss last summer. No money for the U.S. military space program and no isolation of the FRG in West Europe.

Since then the number of critical voices opposing SDI among the Free Democrats has increased. Deputy Gruenbeck stated in the Bundestag that this program is rejected by the majority of FDP land organizations. The "young liberals" are even more implacable.

The delegates to the congress held in early December in Freiburg unanimously opposed "any form of sanctioning of the SDI by the federal government."

Social democrats are increasingly and frequently raising the question of the FRG's specific contribution to the development of the new phase of detente. What could this contribution be? H.-J. Vogel, leader of the Social Democratic Party of Germany [SPD] faction in the Bundestag, believes that H. Kohl's cabinet must reduce the military budget by at least DM 1.8 billion. The Frankfurt working group of left-wing Social Democrats has published "14 These on the SPD's peace policy." The document contains demands for the abolition of all weapons of mass destruction of FRG territory and Bonn's active participation in the creation of a nuclear-free zone and a zone free of chemical weapons in Europe. It also points out that involvement in the "star wars" program contradicts the interests of the FRG's security.

The main argument of the opponents of SDI is that participation in it under the conditions of the uncontrolled arms race will not strengthen but undermine FRG security. Because the illusion of the impenetrability of the U.S. space shield over Europe is inevitably accompanied by a shift toward the first-strike mentality and the resurrection of the "limited nuclear war" concept.

The country's Communists and progressive organizations offer a broad program of measures aimed at reinforcing the results of the Geneva meeting and implementing real steps in the field of disarmament and detente. Geneva has not only polarized opinions but also alarmed the public, giving impetus to new thinking in the nuclear age.

To all appearances this process has bypassed the Bonn corridors of power where, in Washington's wake, they are discussing "bloodless defense" in space using machines against machines. They are speaking of defense but they are thinking of dangerous military doctrines.

"The path of truth is the only one and it is simple," Montaigne said. "The path of those who are concerned for their advantage is bifurcated, uneven, and uncertain." The path is bifurcated and uncertain for those people in the FRG who are trying to link together the interests of the continent's security and the interests of the military-industrial complex, the Pentagon, and NATO. The path of truth is equal security and genuine peace without nuclear and space weapons.

FRG Makes 'Dangerous Choice'

LD182209 Moscow TASS in English 2123 GMT 18 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 18 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Aleksey Grigoriyev writes:

The West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl has kept his recent promise to the U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz. As it has been promised, on the day of Shultz's return to the U.S. the West German Government adopted a resolution on the participation of West Germany in the implementation of the notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative."

So, following the conservative government of Britain, the ruling conservative-liberal coalition of Bonn said an official "yes" to the U.S. "star wars" plans. The West German Government made this dangerous choice in defiance of the insistent and well-

argumented objections of the parliamentary opposition -- Social Democrats and the Greens Party, in defiance of the serious warning of scientists, representatives of the public and business circles who spoke in Bundestag in the course of the public hearings on the SDI problem and, finally, in defiance of the indignant protests of democratic organizations and the broad public circles of the country against the drawing of West Germany into the dangerous venture of Washington.

Actually, today's decision of the West German Government was mere formality. Chancellor H. Kohl, Defense Minister Manfred Woerner, head of the CDU/CSU parliamentary group A. Dregger, deputy head of the group V. Ruehe and many other Christian democratic leaders pointed out on more than once occasion in their public statements that the participation of West Germany in the implementation of the SDI was morally justifiable and politically necessary. Franz-Josef Strauss, chairman of the Christian Social Union and minister-president of Bavaria, said with the openness typical of him: "I know that the American side is annoyed about the controversial reaction of Bonn to the proposal to take part in the SDI... Kohl can and should take the decision if he does not wish to inflict great damage to the FRG."

The controversial nature of the reaction to the SDI in the ruling coalition should not be overestimated. It is true that unlike the unconditional support for the "star wars" by the Christian Democratic Union and the Christian Social Union, their junior partners by the coalition -- the Free Democratic Party -- expressed doubt whether the implementation of the SDI could ensure security in the world that whether [as received] West German economy, science and technology would benefit from the participation in the U.S. program. However, the liberals were finally persuaded to agree to it first because the decision in favour of the participation in the SDI was predetermined by the leading parties of the coalition, second, because of the pressure coming from across the ocean, including the recent propaganda "lecture" delivered by George Shultz, third, because of the example of London which signed with Washington a "memorandum on mutual understanding" over the SDI. In short, Bonn has again faithfully demonstrated its "Atlantic solidarity."

However, it is not only these factors that induced Bonn to take this step. The militaristic and revanchist circles in West Germany which got the second wind during the three years' rule of the Conservative Liberal coalition are obviously possessed by the idea to put West Germany on the same level with such West European nuclear powers as Britain and France. They hope to by-pass the existing bans and pave the way to equipping Bundeswehr with nuclear armaments through the "space bridge" -- in other words, through the SDI program which is modestly described today in Washington, London and Bonn as a "research" program. The military-industrial complex of West Germany is also eager to get access to the "space bridge."

Its gigantic corporations, for instance, the aviation-rocket concern "MFB," seek to take part in the development of this "gold mine" of the arms-manufacturing business, and it is those corporations that promoted the taking of today's decision by the Bonn government. Under the decision the West German Minister of Economy Martin Bangemann has been assigned the task of holding talks with the U.S. Administration on the economic, financial and technical terms of the participation of West German concerns and firms in the implementation of the SDI program.

Again the monopolies that profit from arms manufacturing seek to push the country towards a dangerous course in the international arena. This has already happened twice in the German history of the 20th century. Today they are ready to sacrifice the security of West Germany, its prestige in the international arena and the opportunities of improving the world situation that have emerged as a result of the

Soviet-American meeting in Geneva for the sake of taking part in the preparation of American "star wars."

Forty years ago fascism and militarism were put on trial as the most dangerous manifestation of the imperialist policy. The verdict pronounced in Nuremberg was not only a just condemnation of the main Nazi war criminals, but also a call for the peoples of the world to remain vigilant with regard to advocates of military ventures. The verdict of the Nuremberg trial is very much topical today as well.

PRAVDA: FRG Backing 'Fatal Step'

PM231145 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 85 First Edition p 4

[V. Mikhaylov article: "Bonn's Fatal Step"]

[Text] Strange and, at first sight, paradoxical events are taking place in Bonn at present. The country contains no significant political forces which have not welcomed the results of the recent Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva or failed to note the importance of the beginning of the normalization of the situation in the world begun by the summit and the need for all countries to promote that process. However, Bonn has taken a step leading in the completely opposite direction: On 18 December the FRG Government decided to start talks with the United States on the terms of participation in the American "star wars" program. The reason why the meeting in Geneva failed to reach agreement on a radical limitation of weapons of mass destruction is well known. There, THE NEW YORK TIMES reported, "the following fact loomed largest: The 'strategic defense initiative' propagandized by the U.S. president is the main obstacle preventing a 50-percent cut" in the two powers' arsenals.

It is clear that those who really seek to end the arms race should at least now, after Geneva, not undertake anything that would bolster in Washington the dangerous and illusory belief that space weapons are omnipotent. And one would expect more from the FRG's political leadership. After all, it is well known what the blind obsession with "miracle weapons" which flourished in Germany itself in the not so distant past led to. It is also well known that "ensuring greater security by a smaller number of weapons" has been proclaimed by the present ruling coalition to be the basic aim of FRG policy. True, belief in the commitment to this "basic aim" was shaken already at the end of 1983 when new American Pershings appeared on FRG territory. But at that time government representatives in Bonn shrugged: The NATO nuclear missile decision had been made by their predecessors and we, they said, have no right to break it, on the contrary, we are obliged to display "Atlantic solidarity." They closed their eyes to the rage of protest in the country, although it was clear even to someone who was blind that the appearance of new Pershings had sharply increased the number of nuclear weapons and reduced FRG security.

However what has now been decided in Bonn, namely to confirm "political support" on the FRG Government's part for the American "star wars" program and to reach agreement with the United States on "improving the basis in private law" for the participation of West German firms and scientific research centers in the program, is bereft of even that false excuse. There is no NATO decision or agreement by the previous government. On the contrary, there is a statement by the federal chancellor already after the Soviet-American summit about an intention "...to take joint care to ensure that the results of the Geneva meeting lead to specific accords and the consolidation of peace in Europe and throughout the world."

About the plans to militarize outer space you can say whatever you like, save that they are designed to ensure greater security with fewer weapons. On the contrary, the people in Bonn who are campaigning for participation in SDI are in fact advocating a new and even more dangerous round in the arms race. The Pentagon program, going under the euphonious name of the "Strategic Defense Initiative," will launch the arms race into the boundless expanses of the universe. And that dangerous plan is proclaimed in Bonn as a program which is "justified and politically necessary and on the whole in accord with the West's security interests."

West German statesmen know that if Washington were to abandon its plans to militarize outer space it would be possible right now to halve the respective nuclear arms of the United States and the USSR. And that just as a start leading to the total elimination of weapons of mass destruction and a crucial limitation of outer weapons. However, the Bonn Government's statements have hitherto found no room to support this life-enhancing alternative. On the contrary, they are hastening to help prop up the main obstacle to peace involving fewer weapons.

The incompatibility of such actions with the calls "to take care" to develop the principles laid down at the Geneva meeting is glaringly obvious. But the matter does not stop there. The FRG's involvement in the American "star wars" program could spur the United States to infringe the crucial limitation of armaments constituted by the unlimited Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems. Moreover, Bonn would itself be guilty of its direct violation, since the ABM Treaty forbids the United States and the Soviet Union to share technology in that sphere with other countries. The FRG Government, however, intends to sign an agreement with Washington on the exchange of the results of research work precisely in the ABM sphere. So what we have here is verbal advocacy in favor of maintaining the ABM Treaty intact while in fact it is being undermined.

Since the fifties, when the talk was about whether or not to give the West German Army access to atomic weapons, there has been no discussion more fundamentally important for the country, and indeed for the world, than the present discussion about whether to join in the American "star wars" program or not. Then the past was too close and the memories too painful. The FRG Government had at that time to renounce weapons of mass destruction and solemnly declared that it would not attempt to obtain them. In the future either. In exchange for this promise the Western powers began to remove one after another the postwar restrictions and in 1984 the last prohibition, a prohibition on producing heavy kinds of weapons, was lifted. And now those circles in the FRG for whom the state's full and equal legal status is defiled by the right of unrestricted participation in the arms race would clearly like to exact revenge and carry out what they failed to do in the fifties.

It is now a question of preparing to break through, bypassing the nuclear phase, into the new generation of strategic weapons -- space-based ones. The organization of the breakthrough is proceeding under a government headed by the same conservative grouping of the Christian Democratic Union and the Christian Social Union as in the time of the debates surrounding the provision of atomic weapons for the Bundeswehr. And a leader of it is that same chief of the extreme right-wing forces -- F.J. Strauss. The only thing is, then he could not yet rely on the now swiftly growing military-industrial complex in the south of the FRG, which is a kind of West German California, and which has elbowed out the traditional weapons foundry of the Ruhr.

The dual aim of the bellicose right-wing conservative circles on both sides of the Atlantic is becoming increasingly evident. On the one hand, to embroil the FRG in the strategic arms race and thereby hitch it more firmly to the Pentagon chariot. On the

other, to give the "star wars" program a semblance of "international" approval. J. Abrahamson, leader of the organization for implementing SDI, has frankly acknowledged that the involvement of West European countries and Japan "will, in our opinion, lead to deeper understanding of the program...and that understanding is a vitally important foundation for a future decision about switching to the development [razrabotki] stage." Relying on the present assertions by Bonn officialdom that FRG participation will be limited "just to research," and that, moreover, just in order to acquire influence over the United States and prevent the militarization of outer space is thus tantamount to believing the tail can wag the dog. In reality the involvement of allies in the Pentagon's armament plans is regarded by the latter as an important support for pushing forward the "star wars" program.

The present situation in the world is such that in no single country, including the chief Western power, is domestic reaction capable on its own of overcoming the antiwar movement. That is why the American "hawks" are hurrying to enlist the support of like-minded people on both the other side of the Atlantic and the Pacific in the hope of overturning everything engendered in Geneva and taking the arms race into space.

The main means for achieving these plans are lies and exploitation of people's desire for security. The champions of SDI are laying it on thick to impart plausibility to the transatlantic fabrications that the USSR is "already there" in outer space and that "dangerous instability will arise" in the world if the United States "does not respond." In the FRG an anti-Soviet campaign has been launched along many, one would have thought, forgotten avenues to cover up its retreat from the proclaimed course of "greater security with fewer weapons."

The Washington practice of pushing through new militarist programs by claiming that they promote accords on ending the arms race is also being employed. But in reality things are quite the reverse. The argument about the "benefit" of SDI "in the sphere of civil application" is also devoid of logic. "That kind of hope is unjustified and unrealistic," THE WALL STREET JOURNAL writes. "The technical innovations for civil industry developed directly in its sectors will be 10 times cheaper than the same innovations as 'spin offs' from military developments," the conservative FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE observes. Even FRG President Von Weizsaecker warns the country against "regarding the American space plans as a technological challenge which Europe must accept." The future, including the FRG's future, does not lie in the technology of destruction or the pursuit of illusory "miracle-weapons." The country has behind it many years of experience of international detente, which has shown the broadest strata of the West German population the indisputable advantages of peaceful cooperation.

It is to be hoped that the FRG has not yet had its final say. The choice of a path -- the militarization of near-earth space and the attendant careering out of control of the arms race, or the prevention of this, the halting of the arms race on earth, and the restoration of peaceful international cooperation -- will determine the destiny of civilization. Responsible politicians, particularly state leaders, must adopt a firm, constructive stance in favor of peace.

PRAVDA's Yakhontiv

PM221641 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Dec 85 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Yu. Yakhontov dispatch: "Fatal Step"]

[Text] Bonn, 19 Dec -- So, the FRG Government has decided to begin talks with the United States concerning participation in drawing up the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" program -- for the militarization of space.

Speaking in a radio interview on the eve of the decision's adoption, Chancellor H. Kohl once again spoke of the "vitally great significance" of FRG participation in SDI for West "Germans and Europeans" and of the need to keep pace "with technological progress." But H. Kohl preferred to keep quite about the fact that work on SDI will lead to a new, unprecedented leap of the arms race and to its transfer to the only sphere which remains untouched -- space.

Knowing that the venture to participate in SDI elicits an adverse response even in government circles and in his own party, not to mention among millions of FRG inhabitants, opposition parties, trade unions, the German Communist Party, and members of the antiwar movement, the chancellor made an attempt to reassure the public by declaring that it is supposedly only a question of the research stage and that West German firms will participate in this work without involving state funds.

It is characteristic that the progovernment press ignores the fact that France and also Denmark, Norway, Greece, Canada, the Netherlands, and Australia have refused to participate in Washington's space adventure. Having a penchant for citing supporters of "star wars," these newspapers have not mentioned French President F. Mitterrand's statement that "the transfer of nuclear arms into space will mean not only the end of the ABM Treaty but also a new twist to the arms race spiral."

People here also keep quiet about the opinion of Canadian National Defense Minister E. Nielsen, who has stated that the ABM Treaty is incompatible with work in the SDI sphere.

At a press conference held after the cabinet session its official spokesman repeated the government's "reasoning" and "arguments" in defense of Bonn's position on SDI. In reply to a question from a Soviet correspondent -- What might be the political consequences of this step for relations between East and West and between the FRG and the Soviet Union? -- he said that the government had not discussed this problem and he did not want to engage in speculation about that.

By adopting the decision to begin talks with the United States about SDI, the FRG Government has thereby voiced political support for the U.S. militarist plans and given its consent to its own participation in their elaboration. This is how the progressive public here regards the Bonn politicians' step.

TASS' Aksyonov

LD201628 Moscow TASS in English 1438 GMT 20 Dec 85

["Manfred Woerner Advocates 'Star Wars'" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, December 20 TASS -- TASS commentator Lev Aksyonov writes:

FRG Defence Minister Manfred Woerner again appeared in the unsavoury role of a pusher of the "Strategic Defence Initiative" dangerous for the cause of peace. Several hours after the FRG Government adopted the decision to start talks with the USA on the participation of West German firms and companies in the implementation of the "star wars" programme, Woerner was eulogising that militaristic project, addressing the 28th meeting of the Bundeswehr's command in Karlsruhe. He even went so far as to urge West European NATO members to build up other combat systems at the same time with the participation in implementing the SDI.

Adopting the decision in favour of the SDI, the Bonn leaders not only dealt a blow at genuine interests of peace and security. They actually revoked the statements about the results of the Geneva meetings that were made on the banks of the Rhine just a few days ago. Suffice it to recall the pronouncements by Chancellor Helmut Kohl about the intention to exert joint care so that the results of the Geneva meeting should lead to concrete arrangements, to the consolidation of peace in Europe and the whole world. According to the distorted logic of militarists, that was expressed in Woerner's speech, it is precisely the build up of the arms race and its transfer to space that promote "the consolidation of peace in Europe and in the whole world."

Fulfilling the order of genuine rulers of the FRG, owners of arms manufacturing concerns, Woerner exerted himself to the utmost in order to convince the "intransigent" of the need to join in the plans of the militarisation of outer space. The Bonn minister and his colleagues, who adopted an extremely dangerous decision, not only have done a disservice to millions of citizens of their country. By following in the wake of the Washington administration and heeding the demands of the West German military-industrial complex, they assumed a grave responsibility by assisting a breach of the treaty on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems, a treaty of unlimited duration.

Communists, Others Condemn FRG

LD191534 Moscow TASS in English 1341 GMT 19 Dec 85

[Text] Bonn, December 19 TASS -- The Presidium of the Board of the German Communist Party has condemned the FRG Government's decision to take part in the "star wars" program. In its statement circulated here the Communist Party says that this dangerous step was taken against the will of the overwhelming majority of the country's population. Support of the American program for militarization of space is at variance with the national interests of the FRG and Bonn's assurances on its intention to promote peace.

The decision on the FRG's participation in preparations for "star wars," the statement says, also indicates that the conservative-liberal government is acting in the interests of the reactionary forces both in the United States and the FRG, in the interests of big capital and the military-industrial complexes of the two countries.

The document expresses the determination of the West German Communists to continue campaigning against the "Strategic Defence Initiative" which, if realised, will not increase but undermine the security of the FRG. The only way to respond to Bonn's decision is to step up the joint struggle against Washington's dangerous space venture and the FRG's participation, the Presidium of the Board of the German Communist Party stresses in its statement.

16 January 1986

Horst Ehmke, vice chairman of the Bundestag group of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, also criticized the decision of the Bonn cabinet to join in the SDI. He stated that this decision of the government can only undermine security and represents an unsuccessful attempt to create the impression that the SDI is merely an "economic project." A representative of the Greens party in the Bundestag stressed that the FRG's participation in the SDI would upset the strategic power balance and lead up to a dangerous spiral of the arms race, involving also nuclear weapons.

The coordination committee of the peace movement of the FRG said in Bonn that the SDI program contradicts the clearly expressed will of the majority of the West German population.

The West German people reject what is in fact a policy of preparing war. The illusion that it is possible for people to protect themselves against nuclear missiles and survive in nuclear war must not be allowed to impress itself on the minds of supporters of the government coalition parties (CDU/CSU - Free Democratic Party.)

At the same time the NATO leaders used the Karlsruhe conference of high-ranking Bundeswehr officers as a rostrum for not only justifying the FRG's participation in the SDI but also calling for further conventional and nuclear arms build-up. The conference was also attended by NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington.

In his statement at the conference he criticised Greece, Denmark as well as opposition parties in the FRG and Britain for opposing Washington's "star wars" program and cooperation by other countries in it.

Shevardnadze, FRG Ambassador

LD201922 Moscow Tass in English 1844 GMT 20 Dec 85

["Conversation with Ambassador" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, December 20 TASS -- Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze today received the FRG's ambassador to the Soviet Union Hans Joerge Kastl at the latter's request.

The ambassador touched upon some aspects of relations between the USSR and the FRG in the light of the present-day international situation.

Eduard Shevardnadze, having confirmed the Soviet Union's readiness to cooperate with the FRG on the basis of the Treaty of Moscow, emphasised the decisive importance of questions of security for the further development of bilateral relations between the USSR and the FRG. Anxiety was expressed in this connection over the decision taken by the FRG Government the other day to start talks with the U.S. side about involvement of West German firms in the so-called "Strategic Defence Initiative" of the United States. It was stressed that by taking this road the FRG would become an accomplice in unleashing an arms race in space with all consequences to follow. Hope was expressed that the FRG Government will give a thorough consideration to everything that refers to the SDI programme before ultimately committing itself to the participation in its implementation.

FRG, Italian Participation Viewed

OW191350 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1150 GMT 19 Dec 85

[From the "World Today" program presented by Igor Fesunenکو]

[Text] You already know from press reports that, after Britain, the FRG Government also decided to join the U.S. "star wars" project. This decision was made at yesterday's -- the last this year -- sitting of the Bonn cabinet.

Bonn's ministers thereby presented their fellow citizens with a none too pleasant Christmas gift.

But Washington is heartened by this success and, seeking to isolate France, which is resisting these plans, it has now decided to begin the indoctrination of Italy, striving to also include it in its space venture.

As reported by the U.S. journal AVIATION WEEK & SPACE TECHNOLOGY, Italian official representatives plan to meet with leaders of the Strategic Defense Initiative organization in Washington before the end of the year.

On the agenda for these talks are questions of the possible participation of Italian corporations in the work of the "star wars" program.

According to the journal, the initiators of these contacts -- besides, of course, the Pentagon -- are Italian military concerns, who see in the "star wars" program new and truly inexhaustible sources of profit.

'Serious' French, FRG Differences

LD182111 Moscow TASS in English 1505 GMT 18 Dec 85

[Text] Paris, December 18 TASS -- TASS correspondent Yuriy Lopatin reports:

The regular, 10th, meeting in the outgoing year between President Francois Mitterrand of France and Chancellor Helmut Kohl of the Federal Republic of Germany concentrated on military-strategic issues. Attending the Franco-West German talks at this level were for first time every top military man of both countries.

At the press conference upon the conclusion of the meeting, the president and the chancellor announced moves to further build up bilateral military cooperation. To this end, they intend to make a more active use of military clauses of the 1963 Paris Agreement. F. Mitterrand said that the two countries decided to give a fresh impetus to cooperation between the French and West German armed forces.

At the same time, the talks confirmed that the two countries have serious differences which, according to the newspaper LE FIGARO, are not narrowed to any degree despite so frequent Franco-West German contacts at summit level.

The press points out that the positions of Paris and Bonn on the international scene differ on, among other things, their attitude to U.S. space militarization plans.

16 January 1986

France rejects the "star wars" project, regarding it as perilous to the cause of peace, whereas Bonn expresses readiness to join efforts within the framework of the "Strategic Defence Initiative." Local observers called attention to the fact that at the moment when F. Mitterrand met Kohl at the Elysee Palace, the newspaper LE MONDE has published an interview given by French Defence Minister Paul Quilès, in which the latter analyzed in detail the U.S. project, subjecting it to scathing criticism and describing it as unworthy of trust even in the long term.

French mass media says that divergencies between France and West Germany are not limited to the "star wars" sphere alone, but also cover issues of the so-called European development, the currency and economic spheres and bilateral cooperation in specific scientific and technical projects.

Mitterrand Confirms Rejection

PM181210 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Dec 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Mitterrand: 'I Refuse'"]

[Text] Paris, 17 Dec -- In an interview with TF-1 TV French President F. Mitterrand has reaffirmed that France will not participate in the U.S. "star wars" program. "I refuse to become involved," he stated, "in the implementation of a space military plan which in fact will merely lead to the intensification of international tension and will put France in a subordinate position."

"When I met with President Reagan in Bonn," Mitterrand continued, "he explained to me that he would like France to participate in SDI as a subcontractor. We also have space ambitions," the president noted, "but as far as SDI is concerned everything will be decided by the United States alone and France would play the role of a mere subcontractor. In an attempt to shape a space strategy for civil purposes -- and, if necessary, for military purposes -- France, in my opinion, must look first and foremost to Europe," he continued.

"This question still has to be thought through, and France can do it itself, but Europe is not yet politically capable of embarking on such matters on a global basis." Going on to answer a question about the consequences of this position for French enterprises, Mitterrand stressed that they "will be able to sell everything they want to whoever wants to acquire their products," and he does not intend to hamper them.

France's Refusal Examined

LD252218 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 25 Dec 85

[Nikolay Borin commentary]

[Text] In the following commentary, our observer, Nikolay Borin, examines the implications of France's refusal to join the American SDI program. Here is what he writes:

Of the 18 countries invited to join the program, only Britain and West Germany have offered to take part. Anxious to promote its "star wars" project, the White House has called in its propaganda experts, including the assistant secretary of defense Richard Perle. Perle, an unmistakable hawk, has become notorious both in America and Europe for trying to undermine East-West relations as well as Soviet-American treaties. No wonder he was assigned the job of starting yet another propaganda attack to force the hands of the West Europeans. Mr Perle sounds like an army corporal in front of his squad, the way he is talking to the allies. He says he is sure Paris will wind up by taking part in SDI. He also says there is an erroneous European perception of the program since it has never been well explained to them that "star wars" is a purely defensive venture and therefore poses no threat to Europe.

This sounds like a failed reproach to Shultz and Weinberger, as if they had not done all they could during their recent European trips to promote "star wars". But it's nothing as compared to what Perle has said about France. He said the French refusal was based on a misunderstanding of the project. Those poor naive French. They have simply failed to appreciate the generosity of the Americans who certainly don't think about anything but peace through SDI. But from a recent interview with President Mitterrand, France has formed a fairly good picture of the American intentions. Asked by French television why France was refusing to take part in SDI, he said it didn't fancy the role of a subcontractor in a project in which all the decision making would be done by the United States. Besides he added, it's not yet clear what the Americans are going to start with. As for the French defense minister, Paul Quilès, he believes SDI may draw France into yet another round of the arms race, though his country wants this race to be ended.

Mr Perle's offer to explain SDI better to the West Europeans comes too late. This program has been under their scrutiny for a long time now. In one of a series of articles on SDI, DER SPIEGEL says that with the world sitting on a nuclear stalk sufficient to blow it up 67 times over, the American munitions companies have problems expanding their production. Whoever carries (the) strategy to the next higher stage, that is into outer space, will grab all the contracts in the 30 years to come.

The magazine echoes the view of American industrialists who expect a crisis to affect the production of nuclear warheads within 4 years. This being so, it says, can America afford to give up SDI?

The White House is using Mr Perle to promote SDI in Western Europe but it would not need to go on with this propaganda battle were it to agree to shut the door on any space weapons, both offensive and defensive and to make space a medium of peaceful international cooperation. That's what the Soviet Union is offering not only to America but to the whole world. Such cooperation would produce far more benefits in terms of technology than would programs with narrow military applications like 'star wars'. Civilian space exploration would last for ever, not for a mere 30 years. The question, therefore is not as DER SPIEGEL puts it, whether or not America can afford to give up SDI but whether it will be able to break free from the tight grip of its military industrial complex; a grip which is felt not only by America.

Attempts To Drag Turkey Into Plans

LD171518 Moscow in Turkish to Turkey 1400 GMT 13 Dec 85

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] According to MILLIYET, the regular round of talks in Ankara on the extension of the Turkish-U.S. defense and economic cooperation agreement was concluded without achieving results. According to the local press, this is connected with the U.S. approach of (?contempt for) Turkey. The U.S. approach to Turkey is based on the former's hegemony in the region. Washington, in return for military aid, is trying to obtain from Ankara new military and political privileges and to drag its NATO ally, Turkey, into aggressive preparations in the Middle East.

The volume of U.S. military aid has always been a source of dissatisfaction in Turkey. Recently, U.S. attempts to secure the participation of the Turkish side in the implementation of the "star wars" program have assumed dangerous proportions. It is very natural that these U.S. intentions, which endanger world peace, should cause concern in Turkish public opinion. Despite this, Washington is not abandoning its insolent attempts to put pressure on Ankara through the use of its fabrications concerning a threat from the North. Furthermore, the same is occurring both at the Ankara talks and at the NATO Council meeting in Brussels. Nevertheless, in the view of local observers, it is doubtful if Turkey, despite its NATO membership, will follow in Washington's wake and sacrifice its good-neighborly relations with the countries in the region in the cause for Washington's imperialist ambitions.

Norwegian Eureka Participation

PM201022 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent N. Ivanov "Notes Apropos": "What 'Eureka' Promises"]

[Text] Oslo—From the beginning of next year Norway will be actively involved in the work of the European Space Agency (ESA). The entrance fee of 19.5 million kroner has already been paid. The Foreign Ministry explained that its decision would make it possible in the future to considerably widen Norwegian industrialists' contacts with their West European partners and to raise the level of scientific research. Oslo gave this explanation as it dispatched a representative to the conference of participants in the "Eureka" scientific and technical cooperation projects.

It must be said that Norway has always been wary about any steps geared to the country's economic and political integration in Western Europe. It has been more than 13 years since the Norwegians refused to cross the threshold of the EEC. But the European community's supporters continued to try to build bridges between Oslo and the Common Market. The Conservatives, currently in power, have been particularly successful in this respect, although, as the polls have shown 7 out of 10 Norwegians still believe that they should remain outside the Common Market.

All the same the two decisions taken by K. Willoch's cabinet recently have sparked off a new debate about Norway's place in the West European community. The fiercest arguments flared up over the "Eureka" project. Norway was the first NATO country to oppose the U.S. "star wars" project, although at first, the rejection was not categorical. At a NATO council session Defense Minister A. Sjaastad tried to get away with a general condemnation of plans for the militarization of space. For this he was severely criticized not only by political opponents, but also by coalition allies. As a result, the government was forced to submit a so-called "space resolution" for discussion by the Storting (the parliament). It obliged the K. Willoch cabinet in all international organizations, even in NATO, to oppose all programs aimed at developing and deploying any weapon systems in space. Oslo publicly dissociated itself from U.S. plans to place weapons in near-earth orbit.

Now, 6 months later the old fears have been revived following the Storting debate. Socialist Left Party leader Hanna Kvanne anxiously wonders: Will we not have a situation where by participating in "Eureka" we are contributing, if not directly, then indirectly, to the development of the U.S. military program? "The achievements of West European researchers can be used by the Pentagon to accelerate the 'star wars' plans" she claims.

A statement by the initiators of the "European technological community" that the program will be peaceful did not take the heat out of the debate in the northern European countries. A curious document was published in the Norwegian paper FRIHETEN. It is a copy of a prospectus sent out to the "Eureka" participants. The project leaders are inviting participation in the development of a high-performance laser. Those who agree can expect to be cooperating with one or more U.S. concerns, the document says. Does this not mean that through "Eureka," Norwegian enterprises will be linked to the U.S. market where there is a great demand for technical innovations which could save time in the creation of space weapons, FRIHETEN asks.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1210

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

POSSIBLE SOVIET COUNTERMEASURES TO SDI SPECIFIED

PM211603 Moscow TRUD in Russian 21 Dec 85 p 3

["Political observer's notes" by Colonel V. Morozov, USSR State Prize Winner: "Space Must be Peaceful"]

[Text] The Soviet Union is persistently struggling for the elimination of the threat looming over mankind of a world nuclear conflagration and by its specific peace proposals and initiatives is seeking to open the way to the solution of the most important questions connected with ending the arms race, above all the nuclear arms race. This consistent, peace-loving Leninist policy has won our country high praise among the world's peoples.

A situation has now formed whereby the position taken by Washington on the "star wars" issue has become the main obstacle in the path to an agreement on arms control and the reduction of nuclear arsenals. What are the "star wars" plans which the U.S. leadership is elaborating and which are concealed behind the shawl of the "strategic defense initiative" (SDI)?

SDI is the U.S. Administration's latest illusory gamble for achieving military superiority over the USSR. It provides for the creation [sozdaniya] of an all-embracing (total) ABM system on earth and in space allegedly capable of fully guaranteeing the destruction of Soviet missiles and spacecraft and thereby creating conditions for delivering a first nuclear strike with impunity. The calculations are based on the possibility of disarming the other side and depriving it of the capability of delivering an inevitable retaliatory counterstrike while resorting to nuclear strategic and space weapons against military targets, cities, and regions of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Those are the true designs of the SDI authors. They are dreams as overt as they are pernicious: to subordinate the world to their rule on the basis of a bellicose philosophy -- he who is first in space will be first on earth.

The Soviet arguments showing all the dangers of Washington's "star wars" program were convincingly set forth at the meeting with President R. Reagan and at the Geneva press conference. The Soviet Union hopes that what was said in Geneva about SDI was not the U.S. side's last word.

Unfortunately, to all appearances Washington is in no hurry to draw the appropriate conclusions in the spirit of the January accord and the Soviet-U.S. statement in Geneva and is taking no practical steps to halt the arms race on earth and prevent it in

space. SDI will not be a "bargaining chip" at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space armaments, the U.S. President said recently in Fallston (Maryland) in a speech in which he again returned to the results of the Geneva meeting.

As we can see from recent U.S. press reports, the U.S. military-industrial complex and the Washington administration officials who express its interests are accelerating efforts aimed at the militarization of space. The Pentagon has already submitted contracts for the production of elements of space system under the SDI program to a number of the country's largest military-industrial corporations. They include well-known firms like McDonnell Douglas astronautics company, Lockheed, Boeing, Rockwell, Hughes, Litton, and others.

At the recent U.S. congressional hearings on SDI it was established that the cost of the "star wars" program is expressed in very large sums: Expenditure on "research" work alone over 6 years will total \$33 billion while the deployment of the entire space system will cost many trillions of dollars.

This is a reality which must be seen and taken into account and the Soviet Union does take it into account, above all by persistently urging the United States to abandon this extremely dangerous undertaking. At the same time, it is stating its resolve to respond fittingly to Washington's "space" challenge if its program for the militarization of space, counter to reason, is implemented. This was again mentioned authoritatively by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, from the rostrum of the Fourth Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Noting the fact that the United States is continuing its course toward achieving military superiority, he said: "...In undertaking an arms race in space, they are thinking to overtake us in electronics and computers. But, as has already frequently been the case in the past, we will find an answer. And an effective, sufficiently swift, and perhaps less expensive answer than the U.S. program."

In what direction could Soviet retaliatory steps be taken? There are perfectly real and highly effective methods for this. The Soviet Union has absolutely no need to choose the path along which the Washington politicians and strategists "suggest" it travel, that is the path of creating its own wide-scale and expensive ABM defense. Academician Ye. P. Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, addressing the USSR Supreme Soviet session, said: "We do not intend to help the Americans in their aggressive intentions or to sit with folded arms. It is with a sense of profound responsibility, based on a knowledge of the thrust of the matter, that I would like to confirm that Soviet science and design thinking will ensure effective countermeasures economically and rapidly. I stress once more: Soviet science even in the past has very rapidly resolved the most difficult problems and will resolve them now..."

To speak specifically, one can point to the following, simplest option. This is the method of active resistance to the space ABM system the United States is creating. It is prompted by Soviet scientists who have revealed and analyzed the entire spectrum of potential means capable of substantially neutralizing the space ABM system as one of the components designed to secure for the United States the possibility of delivering a first disarming strike with impunity.

The reality of the effective use of this method, among other retaliatory measures, is linked with the fact that the space-based ABM system which is being created in the United States is planned as a highly automated system with a large number of various sensitive elements. For that reason, it will already be very vulnerable and unstable. To neutralize and invalidate this system the retaliating side could use, for instance,

so-called space mines, obstacles in the trajectories of space combat stations, phony rocket launchings, various coatings reflecting laser radiation, and other means.

It is perfectly obvious that this effective network of countermeasures could be created more rapidly, using to a considerable extent the technology which is already available, than the wide-scale U.S. system which lays claim to a supreme degree of efficiency. The calculations made by Soviet scientists show that the system of reliable countermeasures could also be substantially cheaper than a system deployed on the basis of implementation of Washington's SDI program. For instance, it has been calculated that the cost of an effective countersystem could be no more than 1-2 percent of the cost of a wide-scale ABM system.

There is another, even more effective, method of restoring the disrupted military-strategic equilibrium in the event of the deployment of a U.S. space-based ABM defense system. It provides for an increase in the quantity and improvement in the quality of Soviet offensive armaments (their effectiveness, accuracy, and yield) so they can overcome the comprehensive U.S. ABM defense and neutralize and thus invalidate the "star wars" electronic space machinery it is creating.

Naturally, these two options could be combined.

Finally, we well remember the year of 1941 and we have learned from its bitter experience. Today the USSR's material potential and scientific-technical potential are such that our country, if necessary, is quite realistically capable of responding to the United States just as it intends to threaten us from space. "And surely the Americans will not feel more comfortable if our weapons are added to the echelons of space armaments which Washington is planning in space?" M.S. Gorbachev has asked. Answering this question, he said: "After all, the United States cannot hope to have a monopoly in space. This is all frivolous at the very least."

The question now arises intensely: Is space to be or not to be peaceful? The USSR is not to blame for the fact that it has arisen. It was put on the agenda of world politics by the present U.S. Administration by embarking on the creation [sozdaniye] of space strike weapons capable of resolving strictly offensive tasks. It is perfectly obvious to all sober-minded people that the implementation of Washington's "star wars" program will inevitably lead to the appearance of space weapons. That will mean that in the arms race mankind will cross the dangerous point of no return. That is why the problem of preventing the militarization of space has now acquired paramount importance. The further development of the entire military-political situation in the world and ultimately, the destiny of mankind depend on its solution.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1210

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR'S 'TOP PRIORITY' PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS DISCUSS SDI

LD231652 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 23 Dec 85

["Top Priority" program, presented by Vladimir Posner, with Dr Radomir Bogdanov, deputy director of the United States of America and Canada Institute, and "his colleague," Dr Sergey Plekhanov]

[Text] [Posner] Hello everybody and welcome to "Top Priority." Today the panel as usual consists of Dr Radomir Bogdanov, of the United States and Canada Studies Institute, and his colleague Dr Sergey Plekhanov. I'm your host, Vladimir Posner, and this issue of "Top Priority" concerns, well, I guess summing up the year and I'd like to look with you, gentlemen, at the main issues, the main events of 1985 as far as Soviet-American relations are concerned. Basically, that is our interest today. Now what would you say was the number one event or which event would you single out as being most important in Soviet-American relations for this year?

[Bogdanov] It goes without saying that the most important event of the year is, of course, the Geneva summit. But we have...

[Posner] Right.

[Bogdanov] ...We have already discussed that. We talked about that rather at length and we have explained to our listeners over there our views on that. Now I believe we should talk about, more about what we expect in the next year, what perspective we see, if any, and that's where my difficulty begins. You know, to be frank with you, I have very mixed feelings. It's a funny mixture of hope, funny mixture of frustration, if you like. But it's human to be rather on the optimistic side than on the pessimistic side. But if you hear what is going on — what they say from that American and what speeches you hear, what's going on in the Congress, between Congress and the administration, it makes you a little bit pessimistic about the outcome, what is called now spirit of Geneva. [sentence as heard] So I -- I would put it like that: The spirit is there, but our problem is how to make this spirit to be always there and to be finally translated into concrete deeds.

[Posner] Dr Bogdanov, I think that's quite clear and I see your view. What we're talking about is spirit that was created at Geneva in November and you're also talking about things that may make it impossible for that spirit to develop. Now, Dr Plekhanov, last time I know you wanted to bring up a subject which is probably the greatest roadblock to the development of that particular spirit, SDI, clearly, and I didn't give you the possibility because I thought that it's too important a subject simply to touch on and then pass to something else. Probably you would like to continue with that today, if I've guessed you right. I'm not much of a mindreader, but...

[Plekhanov] Well, you guessed it right and it's obvious that now the SDI is the major stumbling block on the way to deep cuts in offensive nuclear arsenals. It is common knowledge that both sides agreed in Geneva that they should work for an agreement in the framework of 50 percent cuts in the numbers of offensive strategic weapons. But it is clear also that such an agreement can be reached only provided the strategic defense program is stopped; because it really makes no sense to cut radically offensive arms if one of the sides is engaged in creating a program or a system which is designed to make those offensive arms impotent and obsolete, even if partial. We view the American SDI program as designed to give the United States a first-strike capability.

[Posner] Would you please explain once again why we believe that SDI gives the United States a first-strike capability?

[Plekhanov] Because the SDI will certainly not give the United States an absolute security against a first strike by the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has so many missiles that the SDI would be impotent in that case. The Soviet Union has no intention to strike the United States first, but this is the intention which is ascribed to us by some American strategists. On the other hand, the SDI, this shield which will be -- which is being designed and researched -- would be effective against an opponent which has already been struck. In other words, it would be effective against a very weak opponent, so it's easy to see how the system would work if it is to complement a first strike by the United States. In combination with the development of offensive arsenals of the United States making it more accurate, more powerful -- and those programs are of course being carried out -- the simultaneous development of a strategic defensive system, this amounts to a very dangerous military potential that is being -- that is growing -- on the American side, something that we will have to take into account. And of course the most -- the most dangerous aspect, a new (?term) aspect of the SDI, because the system will materialize only after some years, the most dangerous short-term consequences is the destruction of the existing mechanism for arms control because the SDI is in clear conflict with the ABM Treaty. Now...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] The ABM -- sorry, Sergey -- ABM Treaty, we should both remember, we should remind our listeners that the real pillar of the arms control and the most efficient pillar is ABM Treaty, which has been gradually destroyed by SDI.

[Posner] Would you agree with the view that some of the people who are backing or pushing SDI are pushing it precisely as a means of destroying existing agreements?

[Bogdanov] Oh yes, oh yes, I am absolutely sure. You have very smart people at American [as heard] and (?seated) in some very important administration centers. They are very knowledgeable people and they know for sure at what to strike first just to make SDI possible.

[Posner] Tell me, there seems to be different SDI's in the United States. You have President Reagan's SDI, which would seem to be this belief in an impregnable shield. Then you have the SDI of Caspar Weinberger and you have the SDI of General Graham and General (Kegan), and you have all these different SDI's. What in your opinion is SDI really all about? I mean which -- what is really the sense of it? We said it's to destroy, perhaps, existing agreements. What else do you see as the hidden motivation that is perhaps not so evident?

[Plekhanov] Well, it's clear that a lot of people working on SDI are looking for a way to get out of the nuclear deadlock which has been in existence for several decades between the Soviet Union and the United States. The existence of the strategic balance between the offensive forces of the two powers makes it patently impossible to wage a

major war between the United States and the Soviet Union. Now we may be happy about that, some people are unhappy about that because some soldiers just want to fight wars, you know, and...

[Posner] You're talking about some very high-ranking soldiers, I would say.

[Plekhanov] ...and high-ranking soldiers, low-ranking soldiers, all kinds of soldiers, and the military are frustrated for the first time in the history of mankind that the major military instruments that those people have cannot be used. Also, of course, another very clear element behind SDI is a material interest of those people who are in the business of producing arms. For arms manufacturers, for electronics producers, for laser producers, or those people who want to become lasers producers, aerospace industry, the SDI is the biggest project to come their way in many, many years.

It is set maybe to cost \$1 trillion, the development and deployment; one of the price tags is \$1 trillion. You know, it may be bad for the economy as a whole, but it's very good for those people who will be paid that trillion dollars.

[Bogdanov] But you know what surprises me all the same in that particular, in that material, what you call a material interest, you know. They will have some money, they will make some money, maybe handsome money, on that, but what they will produce in the final end. They will produce such insecure situation because the Soviet side will have to take countermeasures, and, please believe, very efficient countermeasures, that American security again will be jeopardized very much. So let me put this question: Does those [as heard] handsome money pay at the final end? What I mean to say, that they may reach such a stage that both of us will be destroyed with their handsome money. So, what I intend to say, it seems to me like unnational, antinational policy of the final [word indistinct].

[Plekhanov] I think one can describe, I'll try to describe the SDI in a short way and I think it can be described as a jump into a dangerous unknown, a jump into the dangerous unknown.

[Posner] What Dr Bogdanov was saying reminds me of a conversation a friend of mine had in the United States. He's a professor at a university in California and he was talking to a young man who said: I want SDI. And the professor said: Well, why do you want it? Because, he said, I work in that area, I make good money out of it. And my friend said: But have you ever thought where it leads to? And he said: Oh, I don't want to think about that, that doesn't concern me. And I think that's exactly the point you were making.

But I want to get to another issue and that is, if SDI is all that you said, it has the military mind behind it, it is seeking to find a way to break out of this balance, this equilibrium between the Soviet Union and the United States. It has the financial mind behind it, that is the people who want to make profits. It has the political mind behind it, the people who are seeking to destroy the agreements that have made it possible to control, to a certain extent at least, the arms race. With all of that behind it, is there any chance at all that we can somehow stop it from happening? Not we, the Soviet Union alone, but in general is there any kind of reason to believe that this can be done because we've all said that without it there's not going to be any progress in arms limitation, let alone arms reduction.

[Bogdanov] Vladimir, if you put that question now today I would say that it is not too late, but if you put that question tomorrow or day after tomorrow, I am sorry, I might be (?willing) to say Vladimir, sorry, it's too late. If you look how the program, SDI program, is being (?theorized), then you feel a little bit ill at ease, because the --

you just see the acceleration of the program all the time. But we still believe it is not the last word of the American Administration because we still believe that the Americans [as heard] and you have enough reasonable people, enough reasonable people to see all the danger we and the Americans are going to face because of all that. Then again, I believe, maybe it's something very subjective, but I still believe in the common sense, number one. Number two, my belief is supported by very, very interesting offer from our side, 50 percent cut in offensive weapons reaching the territory of both sides. That offer, it's so reasonable, you know. It's of course, I understand it, it's a matter for discussion, for finding mutual, you know, adjustments and compromises; but basically it's a very important thing. So I believe that if, if the Americans and they, they weigh this offer, all the consequences of the possible, you know, terrible consequences, they might come to the conclusion that it is better to talk, to find out mutually acceptable solutions than to go ahead with that ominous, ominous, ominous, really ominous, program.

[Posner] Now another point that I'd like to bring up as time is running out on us.

We've spoken about Geneva, we've spoken about SDI and you have mentioned a very important Soviet proposal which concerns a 50 percent cut in offensive strategic weapons. Now there's another Soviet proposal that has been a unilateral proposal as a matter of fact and that concerns the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear tests, both military and peaceful. And that has recently been reiterated by General Secretary Gorbachev.

Do you not feel that this, too, could be an exceedingly important way of capping the arms race and perhaps leading to some real serious agreements in the area of the non-militarization of space?

[Plekhanov] Of course, and it was more than a proposal; it was a cessation unilaterally of all nuclear testing.

[Posner] On August 6th.

[Plekhanov] On August the 6th. And the condition of that moratorium is that the Soviet Union is prepared to extend the moratorium after 1st January of next year, provided the United States join it. One of the main objections that were advanced by the American side was that you really can't verify it. Now of course experts, most experts, agree that it can be verified, but in order to meet the American concern in that area the Soviet Union has made it clear that it is prepared to support international efforts and even on site inspections by the other side, if that becomes necessary, if there is some doubt as to whether the machinery is working well. So...

[Posner] In other words, verification is no longer an obstacle.

[Plekhanov] Verification is no problem. It has never really been an obstacle, but now even more so, now even those people, supersuspicious people, have now nothing to say about moratorium on technical (?front) so we decided to call it a day on 6th August of 1985 and we are expecting the United States to exhibit some good common sense and to join us in this moratorium so that later we could get down to negotiating a treaty which would put a halt to all nuclear testing.

[Posner] All right, I guess that's just about it for today, but I would like to give both of you gentlemen a chance to express in as concise a way as possible your wishes, if you have any, to our listeners for 1986. Dr. Bogdanov?

[Bogdanov] Merry Christmas and happy New Year for all our listeners over there!

[Posner] Dr Plekhanov?

[Plekhanov] Well, merry Christmas and happy New Year and let's keep the spirit of Geneva alive and well in the next year!

[Posner] I would like to join saying that 1986 is designated the year of peace. I hope it really turns out to be that in a good way. I want to congratulate both of you on the New Year and I certainly hope to have you on "Top Priority" in 1986. Thank you. Goodbye.

[Bogdanov] Thank you.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1210

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR'S BOLSHAKOV EXAMINES MOTIVATIONS IN SDI PROGRAM

LD192135 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1245 GMT 19 Dec 85

["Topical Problems of International Life," presented by PRAVDA observer Vladimir Bolshakov]

[Text] Hello comrades. Two years have gone by now since the term "star wars" entered the international political and military dictionary. It arose immediately after Reagan announced in March 1983 that the United States was to begin implementing the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative, or, frankly speaking, a program of researching, testing, and, in the end, building and basing space strike weapons. However this initiative of the President is named, a space shield, "star wars," the truth is known. As the Soviet Union and many foreign military experts think, the creation of space strike weapons and their deployments in near-earth space is not going to strengthen anyone's security, but on the contrary, is going to fan up the arms race. Nuclear weapons covered by a space shield will be even more dangerous. The result of this could be, or surely is even becoming, the breakdown of existing treaty mechanisms which at present restrict the arms race. We are talking first and foremost, about the treaty on antimissile defense and as a consequence of that we come to the transformation of the existing strategic balance into strategic chaos. The arms race will be feverishly fanned in all directions. However the champions of "star wars" persuade us that the United States is now working feverishly to develop space weapons for peaceful purposes. This can hardly be believed; even less can the security of one's people depend on the goodwill of those in whose military-strategic doctrine is fixed the right to making a first nuclear strike.

We proceed from the fact that space weapons are not defensive weapons at all. It should be said that we have no guarantee that the United States will not be tempted to use space weapons to hit targets on earth. In fact, our misgivings are confirmed, by an official spokesman for the United States too. Recently, speaking in Washington at a closed conference of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, John Gardner, the director of a section of the Strategic Defense Initiative organization, admitted that realization of the Strategic Defense Initiative, SDI is its name for short, will sharply alter the nuclear balance in favor of the United States. He set out his scenario for nuclear war with these space weapons. It emerges from this scenario that possession of the antimissile defense system with space-based elements will enable the United States, even after a two-way nuclear exchange, to keep a strike force of strategic offensive weapons.

Gardner's speech, as was noted in the newspaper THE BOSTON GLOBE commenting on this statement, was a rare example of confirmation by a high-ranking representative of the

U.S. Government of misgivings that the hidden motive for the SDI program is to obtain new advantages for the United States in the arms race. Gardner's statement in fact razes the assertions that SDI is a purely defensive system, which, they say, will slow down the arms race and reduce the chance of nuclear war being unleashed.

Reports have now been appearing that the U.S. President intends to ask for \$4.5 billion for the coming financial year for work within SDI; that is 61 percent more than for the current year. As is known, around \$2 billion was allocated for the current year. But even that already allocated is insufficient: The U.S. press, referring to officials in the administration, is now reporting that the SDI organization -- that is, so to speak, the top organization for the implementation of "star wars" in space -- is seeking the allocation of an additional \$100 million in the form of funds for research work with the aim of accelerating underground testing of nuclear weapons. For what? It seems it is for their subsequent basing in space and that, despite President Reagan's continual assertions, the project is not a nuclear shield.

Congress and the U.S. public are, naturally, concerned at such plans, all the more since of late we have been finding out more and more new facts on the direct involvement of the military-industrial complex in the implementation of this Strategic Defense Initiative. A figure in the U.S. defense industry described the "star wars" program most graphically. He said this could be the last vein of gold from the Pentagon in the 20th century. Virtually all the top companies in the U.S. military-industrial complex are now striving to nestle up to this vein of gold, because SDI is designed for 30 years, and, according to preliminary estimates, could need around a \$1 trillion for implementation. More realistic military experts put this sum at around \$2 trillion. Now that the SDI headquarters has been founded -- the organization I was speaking of -- and it has announced its kind of contest for tenders for building the space-based system, applications have been immediately made by 247 firms and laboratories. That is more applications than ever made for past Pentagon tenders for any kind of purchase program.

So far the biggest orders have been obtained by the TRW company, one of the eminent companies in the military-industrial complex. It received \$424 million, most of it for work developing lasers which can be installed in space or on earth. Second on the list of Pentagon contractors for "star wars" systems comes the famous Boeing company. It has received contracts worth a total of \$217 million and is developing an aviation system of infrared sensors and optical tracking systems. The Maxwell firm, on contract for the Defense Department Nuclear Agency, has developed a model for weapons using kinetic energy, known as the electromagnetic cannon. Among the other major firms which have orders for SDI are such companies as Lockheed, Teledyne Brown, Rockwell Corporation, Hughes Aircraft, LTV Aerospace, and McDonnell Douglas, i.e. the leading Pentagon contractors.

When we speak of the military-industrial complex -- this, I would recall, is not our terminology, but a term which has entered the political dictionary of the times from President Eisenhower's farewell speech; it was he who warned of the sinister alliance of military industrialists, generals, and politicians serving the needs of the military industry -- we should have a very clear idea of how this military-industrial complex is getting into SDI.

Recently, some original research was done within the framework of the U.S. Congress: who is it that on the whole gets contracts for "star wars" technology? It turned out that 77 percent of research funds within the SDI fell to electoral districts of members of Congress on the Armed Forces and Appropriations Committee. This is just one more confirmation of the fact that the military-industrial complex's fixers in the U.S.

Congress strive, first and foremost, to grab as large a piece as possible of the budget cake allocated for SDI for their own masters who put them forward for the elected bodies of the United States.

One can frequently hear in the United States and, specifically, something I personally heard in Geneva during a briefing by the official White House spokesman, that the U.S. military-industrial complex allegedly does not have a great influence on U.S. policy. This, of course, is far from so, because about 20 percent of all capital investment in the country for research in the field of complex technology in the United States is now swallowed up by research work in the "star wars" field. This is a most important characteristic of the influence which the military-industrial complex exerts on U.S. policy within the framework of planning appropriations for research work. It should be said that even now testing is under way on experimental models of space-based strike weapons developed in the "star wars" program. Thus, at the Lawrence Livermore laboratories in Los Alamos a free electron laser has already been developed. It will be used to build a kind of, so to speak, laser cannon in the miracle program. I have already spoken of how an electromagnetic cannon has been developed. A new motor -- (?Scramjet) -- has been developed: The concept behind this rocket engine is a kind of hybrid of a rocket and jet engine. Recently, it successfully underwent testing under laboratory conditions also.

A number of firms in the military-industrial complex are now proposing -- and this is also of considerable significance -- new technical sophistications for U.S. inter-continental ballistic missiles. These sophistications are designed to facilitate breaching the antimissile defense of an enemy by these missiles entering the upper strata of the atmosphere.

Plans for the militarization^{of} space elaborated by the U.S. Administration can only lead to an unlimited arms race. This statement was made recently by Richard Goodwin, a former aide to the U.S. President in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. In an article published in the newspaper LOS ANGELES TIMES he refutes the assertions of official Washington representatives that the "star wars" program is aimed exclusively at defense and is capable of creating a reliable shield for the United States. To sensible people, Goodwin writes, the false nature of such assertions is obvious. Goodwin and other U.S. scientists and politicians are now calling upon the Reagan administration to renounce the extremely dangerous plans for the transfer of the arms race into space, stressing that their implementation will inevitably lead to a further rise in international tension and to an aggravation of the threat of war. All sensible people are in agreement with these calls.

Now, after the Soviet-U.S. summit talks in Geneva have ended, the prospect of a lessening of the threat of thermonuclear war has opened up before mankind and all people on earth want measures to be taken that are as rapid and effective as possible in reversing the arms race and not permitting it in space. This is the requirement of the times, the behest of all mankind, in sum, the only alternative to the destruction of all mankind in thermonuclear war.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1210

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: JAPAN TOLD U.S. TRADE CONCESSIONS DEPEND ON SDI ROLE

PM171120 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 5

[S. Agafonov "International Notes": "The 'Trial Balloon' Paradox"]

[Text] In principle it could have been anyone in the Washington league table of semi-official or neo-official figures in place of Richard Allen, the former U.S. national security adviser. Ultimately it is not the figure that is important but the trial balloon that he launched. But in this specific instance it was from Allen that the Japanese audience obtained information on what the new emphasis would be in Washington's policy toward Tokyo.

Specifically I am talking about the former adviser's interview with the Japanese newspaper SANKEI SHIMBUN, in which R. Allen, discussing the inevitability of the further exacerbation of the trade and economic contradictions between the United States and Japan, made the notable statement: "If Tokyo decides to participate in research within the SDI framework, that might, to a certain extent, promote a settlement of the contradictions."

It must be noted that Washington has tried more than once and with different incentives to hitch its Far Eastern ally to the program to create space strike weapons. U.S. envoys to Tokyo have repeatedly trotted out theses about the "defensive nature" of SDI and its allegedly antinuclear thrust. However, this is probably the first time the prospects for Japanese exports to the United States have been made so strictly dependent on Japan's stance on the "star wars" question. The formula put forward by R. Allen sounds like a kind of ultimatum to the Japanese partners.

On the one hand there are Tokyo's economic interests in the U.S. market, the steadily mounting bilateral trade deficit in Japan's favor (estimates are that it will reach 50 billion dollars by year's end), and the acute confrontation with the United States that it has caused which threatens to spill over into an open trade war. On the other hand there is the U.S. program for the creation of space strike arms and the demand that the Y. Nakasone government join in it, in exchange for which Washington is allegedly prepared to "tolerate" Japanese export expansion for a certain time.

The paradox is that with Tokyo's consent to participate in the "star wars" program the imbalance in trade and economic relations between the United States and Japan will not only not be settled but, on the contrary, will increase sharply. For if they join in the U.S. space programs Japanese concerns will surely demand their slice of the cake. And that means that Japanese exports to a new "space" U.S. market will grow. The conse-

quence of all this will inevitably be a still greater U.S. deficit in trade with its Pacific ally.

People in Washington cannot understand that. Thus the formula "relaxation of Washington's claims in exchange for SDI" set forth by R. Allen is by no means dictated by economic motives. It is based on exclusively military-political considerations. Their essence is the desire to use any means to achieve Japanese participation in the "star wars" program.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1210

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET ACADEMICIAN ALEKSANDROV DISCUSSES USE OF SPACE

PM191640 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Dec 85 First Edition p 4

["Answers by Academician A.P. Aleksandrov, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, to questions from a TASS correspondent" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Question: Examination of questions on the prevention of an arms race in space and international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space has ended at the 40th UN General Assembly [UNGA] session. How do you assess its results?

Answer: In my view it is important and at the same time natural that the UNGA, the most representative assembly of states in the present-day world, has devoted great attention to the problem of keeping space peaceful and free for its unobstructed use in people's interests. History has decreed that mankind, scaling increasingly great heights of science and technology, has in our day reached the threshold of a giant leap into space and finds itself at a crossroads, as it were: Will the road into space be a continuation -- now on a cosmic scale -- of the chain of conflicts and wars which have persecuted people at virtually every stage of their development or will space be a boundless sphere of peaceful, creative, and constructive activity? Activity which pools mankind's intellectual, technical, and economic efforts and leads it toward an immeasurably higher level of understanding of the universe and toward the practical utilization of the world [mirovoye prostranstvo] for its benefit. Reason favors the latter, of course, especially since a military leap into space could ultimately be suicidal for terrestrial civilization.

The conclusion reached by the world community at the UNGA session is a conclusion in favor of reason. The UNGA unequivocally advocated that space be used for peaceful purposes and not become an arena for the arms race. Soviet scientists welcome this decision.

Question: Could you say in somewhat more detail what a mechanism for international cooperation in the peaceful use of space might look like?

Answer: I would first like to draw attention to the fact that whereas some 30 years ago -- and in historical terms this is a very short period -- even going out into space seemed fantastic for mankind, today mankind's most advanced forces are posing in practical terms the question of making the transition to the large-scale peaceful development of space and creating new mechanisms for cooperation among states in this matter. In this connection I was particularly impressed by M.S. Gorbachev's meeting with the Nobel Prize winners congress delegation. My presence at this meeting with other scientists provided an opportunity to feel that scientific achievements can and

will be implemented in the practice of the peaceful development of space. Many of us have been captivated by the promising and at the same time, very tangible alternative to the insanity of "star wars" proposed to all the peoples by a great space power like the Soviet Union.

As for a corresponding mechanism, it seems that in practice it would be expedient and realistic to create a world space organization for international cooperation in the peaceful study and utilization of space. Here, of course, it is essential to reliably bar the way to weapons in space. This organization could also have the objective of implementing cooperation among states in their peaceful activity in space. What would be its specific functions?

Even today the use of space means can benefit our planet's population. For example, communication satellites radically improve the transmission of information of various kinds and make it possible to use television and radio broadcasts in any regions of our planet. Satellites help warn of natural disasters like hurricanes, tsunamis, and the flooding of coastal zones by tidal waves. This is capable of saving tens of thousands of lives every year and reducing tremendous economic damage.

Observations from space substantially increase the reliability of forecasts -- of the weather, harvests, droughts, and natural disasters of all kinds. This leads to an increase in the efficiency of economic activity and saves many resources. Furthermore, results are also produced by studying the structure of the earth's surface (saving in drilling operations, for example, studying the characteristics of processes and phenomena occurring in the oceans fishing grounds, for example), watching for the outbreak of forest fires and air and sea disasters, and so forth.

The world space organization would carry out international projects on the study of space and the use of space equipment on the basis of the scientific and economic resources of various countries. It would coordinate the activity of other international organizations -- and such organizations already exist right now -- in the sphere of the peaceful use of space.

This organization would, on the basis of mutual advantage, ensure access for all states to the results of scientific and technical achievements attained as a result of space research and development. It could, in this context, render assistance to developing countries which still do not possess an adequate scientific, technical, or economic basis, in giving them access to the study and use of space and, what is important, in the utilization of the practical results so obtained in order to promote the economic, scientific, and social progress of these countries. It is impossible to overestimate the effect of this activity.

This, of course, would not exhaust the entire sphere of activity of the world space organization, although as can be seen from what has been said, its tasks would be quite broad. I think this would be a necessary and useful organization both for science and for practical activity.

The very fact of its creation would be of positive significance. It would epitomize peaceful intentions vis-a-vis space. This is also important.

Question: In your opinion, what contribution could Soviet scientists make to the matter of international cooperation in the peaceful development of space?

Answer: I am sure it can make a serious and major contribution. The scientists of our country which was the first to go into space, have a sound scientific basis and practi-

cal experience at their disposal for this. From the outset we regarded our successes in space as achievements for all mankind. We have always advocated and we do advocate -- we are doing this in practice -- the expansion and improvement of such cooperation because it is easier for, so to speak, the collective intellect of scientists to make use of space by collective efforts. After all, the practical use of space facilities must be accompanied by the development of space research. Our scientists, for example, are participating actively in the preparation and implementation of flights by international crews on Soviet spacecraft during which important scientific experiments are conducted. In the framework of the international scientific and technical committee which unites scientists of 10 countries, we are conducting research into Venus and Halley's Comet. Also, with the cooperation of scientists of several countries, a Soviet biological satellite was launched which is, in our view, an important scientific experiment. Soviet specialists are participating, together with specialists from the United States, France, Canada, and Norway. In the international COSPAS-SARSAT experiment for the rescue of people in distress.

However, for all the importance of what has already been achieved in the matter of international cooperation in the exploration and use of space, these are, the first, and I would say, so far only relatively small steps. Man, at the end of the 20th century is capable of doing far more in this respect. The prospects here really are astronomical.

This also concerns fundamental research into space. The practice of sending joint, interplanetary research stations into space like the Soviet Venus-15 and Venus-16 stations could be considerably expanded and the joint launching of interplanetary spaceships could be carried out. Thought could also be given to the creation of international space stations and to the organization of joint expeditions to other planets.

The following aspect of the matter is also important: In itself, the process of international cooperation in space would generate new ideas and new trends in scientific questing.

A powerful impetus would thereby be given to the development of science and technology and in its turn, to the even broader use of achievements in space for the promotion of the peoples' economic and social progress. This would be activity worthy of man on the threshold of the new millenium. Soviet scientists are ready for this. We would like to count on such readiness on the part of the scientists of other countries also.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1210

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SOVIET COMMENTS ON PENTAGON YEAR-END INF DEPLOYMENT STATEMENT

Statement Noted

PH271008 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Dec 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Lapse of Memory"]

[Text] Washington, 24 Dec -- A Pentagon spokesman has announced that, in accordance with the U.S. Defense Department's timetable, as of 31 December this year 236 U.S. medium-range missiles on 140 launchers will be deployed on the territory of the West European countries.

Questioned by correspondents about the moratorium on deployment of SS-20 missiles announced by the Soviet Union in spring of this year, the Pentagon spokesman could find nothing better than to say that he "remembers nothing about this." Everything indicates that this short memory on the part of an official of the U.S. military department is explained by the fact that the United States, despite the USSR's proposal on introducing a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles, is continuing its own program for packing Europe with nuclear missiles targeted on the Soviet Union.

Contradicts Geneva Statement

OW270640 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 25 Dec 85

[From the Novosti newscast; Vladimir Kondratyev commentary]

[Text] The United States continues to deploy intermediate-range missiles on the territory of West European countries. According to a Pentagon spokesman, 236 such missiles, including 108 Pershing-2 missiles, will be deployed by the end of the year. Our commentary:

[Kondratyev] Hello, comrades. After Geneva, the world public has a right to expect concrete and tangible steps along the path to disarmament. It is now very important not to set up new obstacles to solving already complicated problems, and to display restraint and goodwill. Our country's foreign policy efforts are dictated precisely by this. But the U.S. side, judging by everything, does not intend to modify its position on the issue of nuclear weapons. Precisely thus, should one assess the striving of the U.S. military department to strictly observe the schedule of fulfilling the so-called NATO dual-track decision.

16 January 1986

According to projected plans, a total of 572 missiles will be deployed. What is most noteworthy is that all 108 Pershing-2 missiles -- first strike offensive weapons -- are already in their base quarters on FRG territory.

Incidentally, the Journal STERN reported this as a fait accompli a few days before the meeting in Geneva. The Pentagon was terribly afraid that the summit meeting could disrupt their plans. Now, not long before the resumption of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space armaments in Geneva in January, official confirmation has come from the U.S. side.

STERN writes in connection with the deployment of Pershing-2 missiles in the FRG: What sort of perverse logic is this, to first sharply increase the level of armaments and then talk about one's sincere desire to reduce this level?

The question is by no means a rhetorical one. With the help of intermediate-range missiles, which represent strategic weapons of our country insofar as they can reach our territory, the United States wants to ensure a unilateral advantage for itself. But all this sharply contradicts the joint Soviet-U.S. statement signed in Geneva, which says that the sides will not strive to achieve military superiority.

Remains 'Acute' Issue

PM271310 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by I. Fedorov: "Two Different Lines"]

[Text] The reduction of nuclear arms in Europe is an acute, pressing problem in contemporary politics.

The Soviet Union, motivated by a desire to consolidate international security and lessen the risk of the outbreak of nuclear war, is making vigorous efforts to resolve it on a mutually acceptable basis. The Soviet side has put forward far-reaching proposals aimed at achieving this aim. If they were implemented, the quantity of medium-range missiles in Europe would decrease substantially. The balance between the USSR and NATO in the European zone in terms of these arms would be maintained at a radically lowered level.

With the aim of ensuring favorable conditions for reaching an accord about this, the Soviet Union, as is well known, introduced from April through November this year a unilateral moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles. A decision to withdraw from combat standby a certain quantity of SS-20 missiles in the European part of the USSR's territory was announced in October. As a result the quantity of SS-20 missiles there decreased substantially and was reduced to the mid-1984 level.

The U.S. side is behaving differently. The other day a Pentagon spokesman announced at a briefing for journalists that 236 U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles will have been deployed in Western Europe by 31 December this year. This includes 108 Pershing-2 missiles and 32 cruise missile launchers. As is well known, four cruise missiles are deployed on each such launcher. These revelations by a spokesman for the U.S. military department were bound to prompt questions from the audience -- after all, the difference between the USSR and U.S. approaches is painfully clear. The Soviet side is taking practical steps to lower the level of nuclear confrontation in Europe. But Washington is acting in the opposite direction -- it is both building up the quantity of its missiles in Europe and refusing to agree on reductions in them.

In this connection the following question was asked: What can the Pentagon say about the unilateral Soviet moratorium on medium-range missiles in Europe? There was nothing to say, since the spokesman for the military department decided to pretend that the Pentagon "does not remember" this. However, even this was no help. The spokesman for the U.S. military department was immediately asked: What comment can he make on the fact of the Soviet side's dismantling of the stationary installations for the deployment of the missiles it has withdrawn from combat standby? He had to admit that this dismantling has taken place, but this, he said, means absolutely nothing. Why this is so, he did not of course explain. It means nothing -- and there's an end to the matter.

But you cannot forbid people to think and draw conclusions. Thus, for instance, F. Fabbri, chairman of the socialist faction in the Italian Senate, declared in connection with the question of the withdrawal from combat standby of some of the SS-20 missiles in Europe: "...it is quite impossible to take away the fact that this is important new proof of the Soviet leadership's desire to contribute to the process of talks on arms reduction. It is, of course, possible to seek tactical motives for this step, but it certainly cannot be said that someone who withdraws some of his missiles from combat standby wants war. We believe that the Soviet Union wants peace."

The briefing by the Pentagon spokesman is not, of course, a significant event in international life. But it encapsulates the present U.S. approach toward resolving the problem of lowering the level of military confrontation in Europe. This approach consists of building up on any pretext its own grouping of first-strike missiles in the region while attempting either to ignore or to misrepresent and deliberately distort the USSR's actions aimed at reaching a constructive accord.

It is hardly necessary to explain that his line on the part of the U.S. military department is not conducive to progress at the talks on nuclear and space arms, whose course, as is well known, it was agreed to accelerate during the Geneva summit. Is it not time to draw practical conclusions from this rather than repeating the former unconstructive position? Europe's peoples are waiting for Washington to answer this question.

U.S. Introduces 'Instability'

LD291646 Moscow TASS in English 1621 GMT 29 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 29 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

On December 31, 1983, the first nine American Pershing-2 nuclear missiles, which are a first nuclear-strike weapon, were deployed and put on combat alert in the FRG. According to the Pentagon's designs, 236 medium-range nuclear missiles, including 108 Pershing-2 missiles, are to be deployed in Western Europe by now. The stationing of U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in close proximity to the Soviet Union's borders has introduced an element of instability in the East-West balance of strategic forces, nuclear confrontation has been further sharpened. This is happening through the fault of the U.S. Administration.

The Soviet Union does not believe that peace in Europe and all over the world can be strengthened through the build-up of arms. Yet, they in Washington, are, on the contrary, banking above all on stepping up militarisation in all directions, including now also outer space, through implementing the "star wars" programme.

Proceeding from the principle of equality and equal security, the Soviet side considers it necessary that a further deployment of nuclear weapons in the European continent be stopped and an effort be started towards their reduction. In general, the socialist countries declare for delivering Europe from all nuclear weapons both medium-range and tactical ones. The USSR not only displays readiness for a reduction of medium-range missiles, but is also acting in this direction unilaterally. Thus in April this year a moratorium was announced on the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe.

Thus, the number of SS-20 missiles on stand-by alert in the European zone has been brought strictly into correspondence with the level of June 1984, and now their number totals 243 units. The main idea behind the Soviet attitude to this issue is that a strict balance between the USSR and NATO in medium-range nuclear weapons be established and maintained at a radically reduced level.

Thus, if the USA withdrew its ground-based Pershing-2 and cruise missiles, the USSR would reduce the number of its medium-range missiles in the European zone down to the level, in warhead count, corresponding to the level of nuclear weapons of Britain and France, the NATO allies of the United States. In principle, the USSR does not intend and does not desire to have in Europe a single warhead more in its medium-range missiles than there are warheads in the corresponding nuclear arsenal of the NATO countries deployed against it and against the other Warsaw Treaty member countries. The United States has refused to agree to a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe in the hope of gaining unilateral advantages. Thus, Washington has demonstrated that it could not care less about the issue of nuclear security in Europe and that it does not seek a reduction of medium-range nuclear weapons in that region.

FRG Turned Into 'Powder Keg'

LD302310 Moscow TASS in English 2253 GMT 30 Dec 85

["New Year 'Presents' of Bonn" -- TASS headline]

[text] Moscow, December 31 TASS -- TASS commentator Petr Parkhitko writes:

Two years ago the coming of the new year coincided in West Germany with the event which cast gloom over the festive mood of most of the residents of that country: The deployment of new American nuclear missiles "Pershing-2" was started there. According to reports from Bonn, on the eve of the new year 1986 the deployment of all the 108 "Pershing-2" missiles was concluded. What was the result of the deployment in West Germany of U.S. "Pershing-2" missiles which, according to American and West German strategists, should have consolidated the security of the West? Today it is obvious that the security of West Germany has not become more stable following the deployment of the missiles. Facts show that the U.S. nuclear missiles have promoted the turning of the territory of that country into a powder keg, into an arsenal of U.S. first-strike weapons.

The development of events proves that the deployment in West Germany of the U.S. nuclear missiles was actually the initial stage of the qualitatively new round of the arms race which is being stepped up by Washington. It is not accidental that the U.S. is actively trying to draw into it West Germany above all other countries. Senior officials of the Reagan administration stressed on more than one occasion that West

Germany occupied a special place in the system of relations between the U.S. and its NATO allies. This is why the White House waited impatiently for West Germany to agree to take part in the notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative". The "special relations" between Washington and Bonn account for the fact that the Reagan administration is hatching plans of the deployment in the territory of that same West Germany of binary munitions -- the chemical weapons of a new generation whose production is being mastered across the ocean. This is being done with the "understanding" and consent of the present Bonn coalition. Two years ago Bonn "congratulated" FRG citizens on the occasion of the new year by starting the deployment of "Pershing-2" missiles. This time the ruling CDU/CSU-FDP coalition prepared two "presents" for the residents of West Germany: The deployment of "Pershing-2" missiles has been concluded and West Germany has joined in the implementation of the U.S. "star wars" program.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1213

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR: U.S. CW ACTIONS RUN CONTRARY TO SUMMIT RESULTS

LD281225 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 28 Dec 85

[Report by international affairs journalist Vadim Biryukov]

[Excerpts] A special report has been drawn up at U.S. Air Force headquarters designed to convince everyone that the Agent Orange defoliant is not supposedly all that harmful and that the incidence of cancer among Vietnam war veterans who breathed in this substance is allegedly no higher than among other Americans.

A U.S. Congress conference committee recently approved a bill on allocations for specific Pentagon programs, under which \$126 million is earmarked to begin series production of a fundamentally new type of chemical weapon -- binary ammunition which has a paralytic effect on the nerves. The bill still needs to be finally passed by the Senate and House of Representatives. So the fixers from the Pentagon have decided to back up their criminal enterprise with this vicious piece of propaganda.

The joint Soviet-U.S. statement on the results of the summit meeting in Geneva said that in the context of a discussion of security problems, the sides had reaffirmed that they backed the complete and universal eradication of chemical weapons and the destruction of existing stockpiles of such weapons. They agreed to step up their efforts to conclude an effective and verifiable international convention on this subject. The results of the dialogue which was held in Geneva must be underpinned by specific actions which lead to the reduction of the military danger on earth and the abatement of international tension. The vote in the U.S. Congress conference committee, however, represents steps leading in another direction.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1212

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

SOVIET JOURNAL INTERVIEWS BUNDESTAG OFFICIAL ON CW-FREE ZONE

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 45, Nov 85 pp 14-15

[Interview with Karsten Voigt, head of the SDPG group in the Bundestag's foreign policy committee and member of the SDPG Board, by A. Tolpegin, NEW TIMES Bonn correspondent: "All Movement Begins With a First Step"; first paragraph is NEW TIMES introduction]

[Text]

The European public has recently been showing considerable anxiety about Washington's plans to modernize its chemical weapons and deploy new-generation weapons—binary—on our continent. West Europeans have held meetings and demonstrations, collected signatures, and advanced concrete initiatives to reduce the danger of chemical war in Europe. Last summer, for instance, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SUPG) and the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SDPG), the leading F.R.G. opposition party, came up with a joint draft agreement on establishing a chemical weapon-free zone in Europe. In September, the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovak leaders proposed negotiations on establishing such a zone to the F.R.G. Chancellor.

New Times. Herr Voigt, it's now four months since the SUPG and SDPG put forward their joint draft agreement. What, in your opinion, is the significance of this initiative, and what comments has it aroused?

Voigt. For more than a year representatives of the two neighbouring states have been conducting negotiations aimed at removing the threat of chemical war in Europe by setting up the said zone. Obviously, its establishment in the heart of our continent would be in the interests not only of the two German states, but of all other European nations as well. We have succeeded in drafting an agreement which offers a solution to such complicated problems as, for example, control. We had, of course, no intention of trying to take the place of our governments. Our purpose was to induce them to enter into concrete negotiations, to show that, given good will, mutually acceptable solutions can be found. Our

initiative has also proved that political parties and their parliamentary factions can, along with governments, make a contribution towards achieving disarmament.

As for the reaction to our proposal inside the country, both the trade unions and the peace movement have supported it. Conservative circles, however, are critical. The idea of establishing a chemical weapon-free zone in Europe has been backed by Social Democrats in Belgium, Luxembourg, Holland and the Scandinavian countries, and by Italian Socialists.

New Times. Quite recently, the G.D.R. and Czechoslovakia proposed negotiations on the establishment of such a zone in Central Europe to the F.R.G. government.

Voigt. We certainly welcome this proposal. We want our government to accept it. If the Kohl cabinet is really serious about its professed desire "to

safeguard peace through arms reduction," it must at least enter into negotiations. We, for our part, shall press for such negotiations.

As provided for by the SDPG-SUPG draft agreement, the chemical weapon-free zone is to include at the very least the F.R.G., the G.D.R., and Czechoslovakia, i.e., the countries situated at the junction of the two military-political blocs. Later the zone can be extended to cover all of Central Europe as this region is defined by the participants in the Vienna talks. In other words, Belgium, Luxembourg and Poland could accede to the treaty. Furthermore, it should be open to other states, including non-aligned and neutral ones. A gradual expansion of the zone would lead, in the long run, to our continent being completely free of these weapons of mass destruction. This, in turn, would facilitate progress towards a global ban on chemical weapons.

New Times. The CDU/CSU representatives hold the opposite view—they maintain that talks on partial measures can only inhibit an agreement on a total chemical weapon ban at the Geneva Disarmament Conference.

Voigt. I believe such a position to be quite wrong. There is no denying that the banning and destruction of chemical weapons on a global scale would be a radical solution. But all movement begins with a first step. It is easier to carry out regional measures if only because they involve a limited number of states. At the same time, their experience would be of help in solving the problem on a global scale.

An added difficulty is that the chemical weapons issue does not only apply to relations between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization. Some Third World countries also possess such weapons. If the opposing military-political blocs succeed in getting things moving and reaching an agreement on a chemical weapon-free zone, more attention could be paid in Geneva to problems relating to the Third World.

I should like to call your attention to yet another point which has a role to play in our discussions here. Some say that the proposal for a chemical weapon-free zone is unacceptable because it is backed by the Warsaw Treaty states. Let me remind you that the SDPG came up with such a proposal back in 1979, although it hardly makes any difference who suggested it first.

I want to stress that disarmament proposals cannot be judged by whether they have come from the West or the East, and labelled good or bad accordingly. What matters is that they should promote mutual security. In this case there will be no losers; everyone will stand to gain. I am convinced that the draft agreement on establishing a chemical weapon-free zone in Europe is a proposal that benefits all sides.

New Times. What is the SDPG actually doing to make the draft a reality?

Voigt. We have reported the results of our negotiations with the SUPG to the government which has promised "to study them in depth." However, I have not yet been informed as to the outcome. The SDPG faction has therefore submitted the draft treaty to parliament for discussion.

New Times. How do the ruling parties justify their disagreement with the idea of a chemical weapon-free zone?

Voigt. Their stand does not easily lend itself to a logical explanation. Back from his U.S. trip last June, Alfred Dregger, chairman of the CDU/CSU faction in the Bundestag, claimed that the United States would not deploy its new—binary—chemical weapons in the Federal Republic and that it would remove war gases from our country. Curiously enough, Dregger made this statement a few days before the SDPG and the SUPG made public their draft, the contents of which he might have been aware of in outline, if not in detail. True, U.S. Defence Secretary Casper Weinberger denied Dregger's statement in early August, saying that Washington had given no such promises to its Bonn visitor.

The logic of Dregger's statements suggests that he wants NATO to take unilateral steps towards chemical disarmament. Our draft provides not only for the withdrawal of whatever chemical weapons there are in the F.R.G., but also for guarantees that there will be no such weapons on the territories of the neighbouring states, members of the Warsaw Treaty. Consequently, this draft ought to suit NATO better than does the position of the CDU/CSU faction leader.

New Times. Dregger's logic is strange indeed. Could it be explained by the fact that, to all appearance, Washington intends to deploy binary weapons

on F.R.G. soil and that the CDU/CSU leadership naturally knows this, but prefers not to put its cards on the table for the time being?

Voigt. Plans for the deployment of binary weapons in the Federal Republic certainly exist. However, judging by the statements of their representatives, all the parties represented in the Bundestag are now opposed to these plans. If the ruling parties were to let binary weapons into the country this would fly in the face of their current statements.

New Times. The CDU/CSU's spokesmen assert that by talking with Communists in socialist countries the SDPG is harming the F.R.G.

Voigt. There certainly are ideological differences between Social Democrats and Communists. But if we are to make progress towards disarmament and safeguarding peace we must conduct a dialogue with the Communists in power in the Warsaw Treaty countries. We are conducting such a dialogue not only with the G.D.R., but also with the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary. We have reached agreement with these countries' ruling parties on the formation of joint working groups to look into the concrete questions of disarmament and broadening East-West cooperation. In this way we are helping prepare a second phase of the policy of détente.

New Times. What does the SDPG mean by the "second phase" of the policy of détente?

Voigt. The first phase was marked by the signing of the Soviet-American treaties on strategic arms and anti-ballistic missile system limitation. The treaties which laid the groundwork for normalizing the F.R.G.'s relations with its eastern neighbours were of great importance for Europe.

By the second phase of the policy of détente we mean, first and foremost, the efforts made to achieve concrete results in disarmament. This purpose is served, in particular, by the proposal to establish a chemical weapon-free zone in Europe. Détente implies, of course, the broadening of all-European cooperation, with the United States taking part. I have in mind cooperation in the spheres of the economy, science, environment protection, and so forth. We must specify concrete projects to be worked on together.

In our opinion, in this process the medium and small European states have a definite role to play which is not to

be underestimated. They cannot, and should not, of course, try to take the place of the great powers, but neither should they stand idly by. By putting forward initiatives expressing their interests they could, in their own way, contribute towards better East-West relations.

There is another question on which, incidentally, we are comparing notes with the Soviet Union's political leadership. In its first stage, the policy of détente collapsed not only because of problems between East and West but also on account of conflicts in the developing countries. It stands to reason that, despite their belonging to different military-political alliances, the developed states could do much by joint effort to help stabilize the situation in the Third World.

New Times. During the recent visit of your Party's Chairman Willy Brandt to the G.D.R. an agreement was reached that the SDPG and the SUPG would start negotiating the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in Europe. Is this initiative part of preparing the second phase of détente?

Voigt. Yes. The talks will be held following the proposal of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security, known as the Palme Commission, to establish a nuclear-free corridor on both sides of the line dividing the two military-political groupings. We certainly realize that this is more important than setting up a chemical weapon-free zone. However, our partners and ourselves intend to do our utmost to achieve success.

. . .

Within two days of this interview the Bundestag debated, on the SDPG's motion, a draft treaty on establishing a chemical weapon-free zone. Prior to the debate, Chancellor Kohl had declined the G.D.R.'s and Czechoslovakia's proposal to negotiate the matter. Most of the Bundestag seats belong to the ruling parties, and the outcome of the debate was not hard to guess.

After the session, I sought out Karsten Voigt in a Bundestag lobby.

"We are certainly disappointed by the fact that most members of the Bundestag have rejected our proposal," he said. "But this is not the end of the question of setting up a chemical weapon-free zone in Europe. We shall include this demand in the election programme of the Social Democratic Party."

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

SOVIET COMMENTARY ON U.S. BINARY DEVELOPMENT PLANS FOR EUROPE

Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 17 Oct 85 p 3

[Article by Yu. Romantsov: "The Dangerous Plans of 'Chemists' Overseas"]

[Text] Upon the recommendation of the Reagan administration, a special item for the sum of 155 million was entered into the Pentagon budget for fiscal year 1986, which began on October 1 of this year. This appropriation was earmarked for beginning binary chemical weapons production in the United States--specifically, poisonous fillings for "Bigeye" bombs and 155-millimeter artillery shells. This, as the Americans say, is the "tip of the iceberg," since in the coming five years Washington plans to throw a total of more than ten billion dollars at preparing to conduct chemical war. It is proposed to spend these resources for modernizing the USA's chemical war arsenal and for increasing the total quantity of chemical weapons from the current three million to five million units. It should be pointed out that the stock of poisonous weapons currently maintained in battle readiness by the American militarists is sufficient to destroy all humanity many times over.

The dangerous buildup of chemical arsenals proceeds against the background of the general whipping up of the arms race by the United States. In the Pentagon's scheme of things, chemical weapons, in conjunction with such weapons systems as the MX and "Trident" ballistic missiles, missile-carrying submarines, strategic aviation, and space strike weapons must afford the United States military superiority--and consequently--the opportunity to dictate its will to the world. They have strategic significance in as much as they are intended for conducting offensive operations and for use in carrying out a first strike. Thus, in the hands of Washington, binary chemical weapons are a factor promoting further destabilization in an already tense international situation.

The special characteristic of binary chemical charges is that they consist of two non-toxic or mildly toxic components placed in divided containers that, upon blending with each other in the flight of a shell or bomb, become a highly toxic substance. They

are intended to destroy all life, including the civilian population, and, being practically harmless prior to uniting the components, they can easily be delivered in complete secrecy to military sites abroad. Even now, every tenth charge from the chemical arsenal of the United States is deployed in Europe--the FRG, England, and Italy--as well as on American ships stationed in the waters of the Atlantic and the Mediterranean Sea. Saturating Europe, in particular the FRG, with chemical weapons, Washington on the one hand places them as close as possible to the borders of the socialist countries, and on the other, places its allies in jeopardy at the same time. According to the NATO bulletin NATO REPORT, "the American General B. Rogers, Supreme Commander of the allied armed forces of NATO in Europe, is exerting the strongest pressure on the allies, demanding their agreement to the possible use of chemical weapons in their countries in the event that conflict breaks out."

The Reagan administration has made the development of chemical weapons a priority program and is seeing to its implementation at a time when the delegates to the Geneva disarmament conference have succeeded in getting down to practical formulation of the elements of a future international convention banning chemical weapons and liquidating existing stocks. Obviously, such a convention, which is supported by an overwhelming number of the world's states, would not suit Washington, in as much as it would bind its hands in its strivings for hegemony. Thus, Washington pokes a stick in the wheel both at the negotiations and around them, and in order to confuse the issue, has unleashed an unbridled, completely false campaign about the supposed military preparations of the Soviet Union, as well as a falsification invented in Washington offices that the USA "lags behind" militarily.

Under the screen of these pretexts, preparation for producing binary chemical weapons proceeds at full speed in the USA. A plant for this purpose has already been built in the city of Pine Bluff (in the state of Arkansas). Its annual capacity is 70,000 units of binary ammunition--both artillery shells and aircraft bombs. They are temporarily closed, but at any moment fifteen contemporary plants may resume their output of chemical charges based on existing poisonous substances.

Washington's dangerous plans evoke serious concern in world public opinion. This is even felt in the United States itself. Thus, the Chairman of the House of Representatives' Foreign Affairs Committee, D. Fascell, declared: "The decision to modernize the USA's chemical weapons arsenal through binary charges filled with a deadly, nerve-paralyzing mixture undermines the military, political, technical, and psychological restraints that contain the spread of chemical weapons in the world." Instead of this, the Congressman pointed out, the United States should contribute to concluding a comprehensive agreement that completely bans the production of chemical weapons.

The Soviet Union, along with the other socialist countries, holds that there should be no place on Earth for chemical weapons. Their production and deployment must be stopped and accumulated stocks destroyed. The proposal made by the Warsaw Pact states in 1983 to free Europe of chemical weapons was an important step in this direction. The governments of the GDR and the CSSR recently appealed to the government of the FRG with an initiative intended to create a zone free of chemical weapons in central Europe. Supporting this in all ways, the Soviet Union declared that it would be prepared to guarantee and respect the status of this zone on the condition that the United States would act in an analogous manner.

The deployment of binary chemical weapons being prepared in the United States, and their placement in Europe, is a crime against peace and humanity.

13017

CSO: 5200/1078

RELATED ISSUES

GORBACHEV SPEECH TO DIPLOMATIC ENVOYS REPORTED

LD271101 Moscow TASS in English 1050 GMT 27 Dec 85

[Excerpts] Moscow, December 27 TASS--Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Andrey Gromyko, a member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Nikolay Ryzhkov, a member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, and Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, received the heads of the diplomatic mission accredited in the Soviet Union at the Grand Kremlin Palace today.

The heads of the diplomatic missions warmly congratulated the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the other Soviet leaders, as well as all Soviet people, on the coming new year. Mikhail Gorbachev thanked the diplomats for their good wish to the Soviet Union.

Mikhail Gorbachev addressed the heads of the diplomatic missions with a speech.

Speech by Mikhail Gorbachev

Dear comrades and gentlemen,

We are at a threshold which does not simply mark the succession of one year by another under the calendar but also has another, much more profound meaning.

The year of 1985 has been packed with events of major historical significance. Some of them have spelled new and formidable dangers to humanity, while others inspired hope. It depends on the activities of people — governments, statesmen, politicians and the world public at large — which of these two trends will prevail in the coming year of 1986 and whether it will become a year of real action to strengthen peace and international security and develop peaceful intercourse and cooperation among nations or the threat of a nuclear catastrophe, which has come to loom large over the planet, will become still greater.

The dangers are obvious. They include an ongoing, runaway arms race and stubborn attempts by militarist quarters to extend it to outer space. They include flagrant violations of the independence

and sovereignty of a number of states and outside interference in the domestic affairs of nations. But it is also obvious that these processes have encountered mounting resistance the world over. And, I shall add, they have added to the responsibility of all states and peoples for the destiny of universal peace.

Each people, each country, big, middle-sized or small, can contribute grains of their national experience to the cause of peace and international cooperation. This has been confirmed once again by the just-ended session of the U.N. General Assembly, which has taken, practically by consensus, a number of very important decisions, including those on the prevention of an arms race in outer space and on an end to nuclear weapons testing.

So far as the Soviet leadership is concerned, by our convictions we are optimists, we believe in a better future for humanity and will continue making vigorous efforts in this direction.

There has been an exchange of signals between East and West of late, which has opened up some hope. I would put it even more cautiously, a gleam of hope for headway to mutually acceptable solutions.

As a result of the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva, there has occurred, as is now widely recognized, a certain warming-up of the international climate. There have also emerged certain points of contiguity (or rather yet potential contiguity) on problems covered by talks on nuclear and space arms. How things will work out there depends first of all on how the accord reached at the summit meeting in Geneva will flesh up in practice. It is on the progress of these talks that it will depend whether 1986 will

justify the peoples' hope for the prevention of an arms race in space and its termination on earth.

Thanks to constructive efforts by a number of states there appear to be shaping the outlines of possible agreements at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. All its attendees have, in our view, to work with their sleeves rolled up to achieve positive results at Stockholm before the next all-European meeting slated for next fall.

The wish of the sides to reckon with each other's interests and concerns is more noticeable at the Vienna talks on force and arms cuts in central Europe. We are now carefully studying the latest proposals of the Western partners.

It seems that the participants in the Geneva disarmament conference began realising better the urgent need to ban the chemical weapons, to end all nuclear tests and exclude the use of force in outer space. But serious efforts will yet be necessary. The USSR is ready to cover its part of the way towards balanced agreements.

The question of nuclear explosions is now in the focus of attention of statesmen and broad public. These explosions have rocked the earth for several decades now. It is time to put an end to that. We are convinced that this is within the limits of the possible.

We have urged and continue urging the USA to follow the Soviet Union's good example and end all nuclear explosions. Should our two biggest powers come out jointly on the issue of so much importance for the whole mankind, this would be a step of a truly outstanding significance.

In your persons, esteemed diplomatic representatives, I am addressing all states and peoples: Let us act so that the year of 1986 should go down into history as that of a decline in nuclear explosions. As the year, when people have mustered up enough common sense to rise above narrow, selfish motives and stop disfiguring their own planet.

Since references are often made to the so-called verification problem as the main pretext for evading a resolution of that issue, I will stress once again most definitely that this problem will not be a stumbling block as far as the Soviet Union is concerned. The Soviet Union is prepared to take most resolute steps down to on-site inspection as regards control over the ending of nuclear testing.

Our country, which has learnt from its bitter experience what a perfidious attack is, has a stake in reliable and rigorous control no less than any other country. Under the present-day international conditions, given the deficit of mutual trust, verification

measures are simply indispensable. Let it be control with the use of national technical means, or international control, the main thing that it be control over the observance of concrete agreements.

The Soviet leadership is ready to reach agreement on a sensible and fair basis and would like to hope for a realistic and solid approach also on the part of its partners. The soil of the resuming talks should be sown already today to good seeds, since only they can ensure good young growth in spring and a crop in autumn.

There is yet another major and acute problem. The Soviet Union is firmly set on seeing essential progress in 1986 in the cause of a political settlement in the Middle East, Central America, around Afghanistan, in southern Africa and in the Persian Gulf area. We are prepared to search for just solutions jointly with other countries, participate, where necessary, in respective quarantines.

The habit to look at conflict situations through the spectacles of East-West political or ideological confrontation is detrimental to the striving to extinguish hot beds of tension or at any rate, to prevent them from growing. It is shortsighted and dangerous to build policy on erroneous concepts. Conflicts grow out of the local social, economic and political soil. Hence they should be resolved in such a way as not to infringe upon the legitimate interests of the peoples, their right to choose, without interference from the outside, the way of life they wish, as well as the right to protect their choice.

Our esteemed guests I would like to stress in conclusion how great the role of diplomatic representatives is at this crucial juncture. The decisions which are taken by the leadership of the respective countries depend to no small degree on the completeness and trustworthiness of the evaluations and information of the former. In general, it will be, perhaps, no exaggeration to say that trust between states starts with ambassadors. I could add that we demand full objectivity and unbiased attitude from our ambassadors.

On our part, we want you to be well informed about what is going on in the Soviet Union, and certainly not only in the capital. The Soviet authorities will further accord hospitality and give assistance to the foreign ambassadors in this. We have nothing to conceal: the Plans and intentions of the Soviet people, of the Soviet leadership are peaceful and only peaceful.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1214

RELATED ISSUES

HOPES FOR U.S.-SOVIET AFFAIRS IN PEACE YEAR VOICED

LD011919 Moscow World Service in English 0810 GMT 1 Jan 86

[Commentary by political writer Vadim Zagladin]

[Excerpts] Nineteen eighty-six has been proclaimed an international year of peace by the United Nations. This is an important act motivated by a sense of responsibility. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned it, like most states, takes the view that the peace year should become a year of practical steps to end the arms race, a year of a radical turn away from confrontation toward relaxation.

Prior to Geneva influential circles, above all the military-industrial complex in the United States, made a considerable effort to prevent an American-Soviet summit, or at least to make sure it would have no meaningful results. Now those circles are attacking the results it produced. This is a multipronged attack, conducted with a variety of means. The United States is adopting a record military budget, which envisages new items of expenditure for military space programs. Target satellites are launched to test antisatellite systems, even new underground nuclear tests are conducted. There is campaigning against any normalization of relations with the Soviet Union. Funds are being allocated all the time to arm the mercenaries attacking Nicaragua and Angola, Kampuchea, and Afghanistan.

It was clear from the outset that implementing the Geneva agreement would require great efforts on both sides. It would require a fresh approach to many issues and, most important of all, it would require the necessary political will in the leadership of both countries. The Soviet side displayed that will even in the past year. It took bold unilateral steps to pave the way into a peaceful future. No similar readiness was displayed on the American side.

One of the arguments originally put forward by the United States in support of what it calls its Strategic Defense Initiative was the argument that it would make nuclear weapons superfluous. Now it has admitted that no, nuclear weapons are needed for the very purpose of implementing that program. Can it be that 1986 is to be the year when outer space began to be studded with nuclear death? Nineteen eighty-six has been proclaimed a peace year. So far this implies only a year of efforts for peace, but we want those efforts to bear fruit so that the newly born year should become one of a practical tilt toward peace in all international affairs.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1214

RELATED ISSUES

PRAVDA 29 DECEMBER REVIEW OF WEEK'S INTERNATIONAL EVENTS

PM282000 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Dec 85 First Edition p 4

[Vsevolod Ovchinnikov "International Review"]

[Excerpts] The year 1985, which was packed with events of great historical importance, is ending. Some of those events pose terrible dangers for mankind, others inspire hope. The dangers are obvious. They lie in the continuing unchecked arms race and the persistent attempts by militarist circles to spread it to space. They lie in the blatant violations of the independence and sovereignty of a number of states and outside interference in the peoples' internal affairs. But it is also obvious that these processes are generating growing opposition everywhere and are increasing the responsibility of all countries and peoples for the fate of universal peace.

Accords and Actions

M.S. Gorbachev's October visit to France and his November summit with U.S. President R. Reagan in Geneva are undoubtedly among the most important international events of the year.

The talks in Paris with French President F. Mitterrand and the talks with other political and public figures laid a good basis for the further development of friendly Soviet-French relations and promoted the strengthening of European security. The Soviet proposals aimed at preventing the militarization of space, curbing the race in nuclear and other arms, and developing fruitful international cooperation in Europe and the world as a whole, put forward during the visit, convincingly demonstrated the USSR's peace-loving foreign policy course.

There has been a certain warming of the international climate as a result of the Soviet-U.S. summit in Geneva. Certain points of contact (rather, potential points of contact) have also appeared in the range of problems under discussion at the talks on nuclear and space arms. Progress at the talks will depend first and foremost on how the accord reached at the Geneva summit is fleshed out in material terms. And it is the progress of the talks that will determine whether 1986 will justify the peoples' hopes of preventing an arms race in space and ending it on earth.

The core of Soviet-U.S. relations has been and remains the problem of security -- the quest for agreements that ensure identical security for both sides. It is probably necessary to get accustomed to strategic parity as the natural state of Soviet-U.S. relations. But the logical conclusion from this is that neither the United States

nor the Soviet Union must open the door to military rivalry in new spheres, specifically in space. Washington's adherence to the "star wars" program has now become the main obstacle to a radical reduction in nuclear arsenals.

The imperial and hegemonist thrust of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" is to reacquire a military advantage over the Soviet Union and scientific and technical superiority over the other capitalist countries and to return the commanding role in the world to the United States. The USSR sees no sense in reducing arms on earth while simultaneously deploying them in space. Why create missiles to destroy missiles if there is a more reliable and secure way leading directly to the goal: agreeing to reduce and subsequently eliminate nuclear missile arsenals?

The Soviet Union, faithfully in keeping with the spirit of Geneva, is seeking to promote the work initiated at the meeting through practical steps, including unilateral steps.

The fixed installations for a certain number of SS-20 missiles in the European zone, which were withdrawn from operational readiness as a sign of goodwill, have been dismantled (but the Pentagon is keeping to its original schedule: On 31 December there will be 236 medium-range U.S. missiles deployed in Western Europe, including all 108 Pershing-2 missiles). The USSR is continuing to refrain from testing antisatellite weapons despite the fact that tests are continuing in the United States.

As for Washington, it has not responded to any of our constructive signals and has not taken a single practical step in the security sphere in keeping with the significance of the Geneva accords. This is all due to the efforts of reactionary circles in the United States which are still banking on confrontation in their desire to inhibit or, even better, interrupt the process which was started in Geneva. Are the deliberate acceleration of the "star wars" program and the attempts to involve the British and FRG scientific-technical and industrial potentials in its implementation and to compel Japan to take part in the venture as well really compatible with the spirit of the meeting? In this case the threat of military rivalry in space is beginning to assume global dimensions.

Unfortunately, many pronouncements by U.S. Administration leaders, including the U.S. secretary of state, contrast strikingly with the language of the Geneva meeting. Politicians should be able to see the point beyond which rhetoric destroys trust and hinders constructive dialogue. But when the political and territorial realities in Europe are questioned, this is playing with fire. It is ridiculous to claim that the buildup of military might offered the United States the chance of talks with the Soviet Union. Such statements are harmful as well as false, because they are an attempt to justify the arms race and could also make it difficult to hold the next Soviet-U.S. meeting.

To avoid hindering the achievement of future accords, both sides must first of all refrain from actions which block talks and undermine active inhibitors of the arms race.

Banning Nuclear Explosions

In bidding farewell to 1985 it is appropriate to recall the Delhi declaration made at the very beginning of the year. In January the leaders of six states located on different continents -- Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania, and Sweden -- confirmed the urgency of their appeal, which was for a total halt to the testing,

production, and deployment of nuclear weapons and delivery means, a freeze on nuclear arsenals, and an immediate start on substantial reductions. The Delhi declaration allocated the key role in this to a treaty putting an end to nuclear tests.

Banning all nuclear explosions is the simplest and most feasible way of stopping the engine of the arms race. Indeed, this in itself would halt the creation of new and the improvement of existing types of nuclear weapons. And there would also be a gradual and even process of disintegration of the arsenals accumulated by each side. Finally, mankind would be saved from the dangerous side effects of nuclear explosions.

That is why the Soviet Union's bold step to mark the 40th anniversary of the Hiroshima tragedy was one of the most memorable events of the year. As is known, the USSR unilaterally halted all nuclear explosions as of 6 August and urged the United States to do the same.

The USSR first put forward a proposal on banning all nuclear tests as long as 30 years ago, soon after some Japanese fishermen suffered the after-effects of a U.S. thermonuclear explosion on Bikini Atoll in the Pacific.

Thanks to the USSR's efforts, a treaty was signed in 1963 on banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water. At the time our country proposed a ban on underground tests as well, but the Western powers would not have this.

In 1974 and 1976 the USSR and the United States concluded treaties limiting the yield of underground nuclear weapon tests and regulating nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes (which, unfortunately, were not ratified by the U.S. side).

In 1977, again on our initiative, the USSR, the United States, and Britain embarked on the elaboration of a treaty on a general and complete nuclear weapons test ban. They managed to agree on practically all the provisions of the treaty. But in 1980, when there was a real chance of agreement, the United States refused to continue the negotiations.

There are no reasonable arguments against a nuclear test ban.

The U.S. side's claims that monitoring is difficult have no basis. The USSR and the United States possess the requisite national technical facilities for this.

Incidentally, it was Washington which blocked international exchange of seismological data and geological and geophysical descriptions of test sites which would have made reciprocal monitoring even more reliable. Its effectiveness would be further guaranteed by renunciation of all nuclear explosions -- for military and for peaceful purposes.

In the USSR's opinion, international systems of verification are also acceptable. For example, one could take up the proposal by the authors of the Delhi declaration to set up stations on the territories of their states to verify that tests have stopped. The Soviet Union is prepared to reach agreement with the United States on certain forms of on-site inspection, provided that it is the total renunciation of all nuclear explosions that is being monitored, and not the use of foreign observers to rubber-stamp them [sentence as published].

The White House is surrounding the halting of tests with an impenetrable wall of preliminary conditions. It says that both sides must first radically reduce nuclear arsenals, balance conventional armaments, and strengthen mutual confidence. As we can see, it is turning everything upside down: It is not the renunciation of tests that should slow down the arms race and pave the way to an agreement, but the other way round.

U.S. Administration spokesmen state that the United States needs the tests to be sure that its nuclear potential is effective. The U.S. press is far more specific on this point. Washington does not want to halt tests because it would then have to abandon development of the nuclear-triggered X-ray laser, which has a key role to play in the SDI program. Underground tests are to be carried out at the Nevada test site for the purpose of creating this laser, which uses the energy of a thermonuclear explosion in space.

The broadest strata of the world public are calling on the United States to follow the Soviet Union's good example and halt all nuclear explosions. If the two major powers act together on such an important question for mankind, it will indeed be a step of supreme significance.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1214

RELATED ISSUES

MOSCOW TV'S 28 DEC 'STUDIO 9' PROGRAM

OW281157 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0725 GMT on 28 December carries its scheduled "Studio 9" program presented by Professor Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, political observer of Soviet television and radio. Participating in the program are Professor Bernard Lown of Harvard University and Academician Yevgeniy Ivanovich Chazov, director of the All-Union Cardiological Scientific Center of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences, cochairmen of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War Movement recently awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. After introducing the participants, Zorin reviews the history of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War Movement and notes that it was recently awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. The participants discuss the success of the movement and its emergence as a political force because of public recognition of the danger of nuclear war.

Zorin notes that Lown's work in the movement has been criticized in the United States and his patriotism has even been doubted. However, much of what he has said and is saying is now also being said by President Reagan. Zorin says that this played a big role in realizing the Soviet-U.S. summit in Geneva.

Lown notes that Americans have come to realize that nuclear war is not an ordinary war. He adds that President Reagan sent the movement's third congress in Amsterdam a message saying that nuclear war must never be permitted, that victory cannot be achieved in a nuclear war. He says that this is the main idea of his movement. Lown speaks in English with voice-over Russian translation by unidentified announcer.

Discussion then turns to the effects of nuclear war, the spectre of a nuclear winter, and the medical aspects of treating casualties. The cost of military spending throughout the world is compared to the cost of eliminating disease and other problems of humanity.

Zorin then asks: "In your opinion, is the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative of President Reagan -- known as the "star wars" doctrine -- an answer to your concerns? Can one hide from the nuclear threat behind this notorious shield? Chazov says that this issue is being discussed by the movement and says that "as precise research has shown, this defense initiative will save neither the United States nor the world. There is accurate data that permits us today to say quite confidently that a nuclear catastrophe will nevertheless occur despite this system." Chazov reiterates the movement's opposition to militarization of space, and Lown outlines a strategic medical initiative proposal to extend medical services around the world through space means.

Zorin points to the contradiction between the movement's Nobel Peace Prize and increasing criticism of its activities. Chazov says this is because of the movement's increased influence and strength, the fact that people heed its findings, and the fact

that it is an example of trust between people of diverse political beliefs. This evokes opposition and irritation in certain circles, especially in West Germany where the movement is particularly strong. Chazov adds: "I think it is also directed against another matter, against the spirit of Geneva. An opportunity for dialogue has emerged, people have begun to talk, and this movement must be restricted in some way." Zorin recalls Gorbachev's meeting with Lown and Chazov and the fact that "he stressed the enormous significance of the public movement to ban nuclear arms." He says: "I think the very fact that the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee received the leaders of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War Movement speaks about the significance that the Soviet leadership attaches to this movement and to the people's struggle against the nuclear threat.

"The Soviet Union is doing and is ready to do everything in order to remove the threat of nuclear self-destruction from mankind." Zorin concludes with wishes of peace to television viewers in the coming year.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1214

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S UN DELEGATE ADDRESSES PRESS CONFERENCE

PM271505 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "UN Mandate: Cooperation for the Sake of Peace"]

[Text] On 25 December a press conference was held at the USSR Foreign Ministry press center for Soviet and foreign journalists in connection with the completion of the main part of the work of the 40th UN General Assembly [UNGA]. Ambassador V.F. Petrovskiy, a member of the USSR delegation who delivered a statement, said that as a whole the results of the general assembly are of positive importance. They attest to a growing awareness of the fact that the world situation is now too dangerous to defer any longer practical measures to normalize it.

The session reflected the change which has emerged in the mood of states away from pessimism in assessing the world political and economic situation and toward the appearance of the hope of its rectification and the attainment of real advances, above all in the most important sphere -- the sphere of security.

The peoples' aspirations, as the UN forum showed, are connected primarily with ensuring that the accords reached during the meeting of the top leaders of the USSR and the United States in Geneva are implemented in practical deeds. The United Nations has directly appealed to both sides to seek to achieve the aim agreed between them and now confirmed at summit level of preventing the arms race in space and halting it on earth.

The main decisions of the session itself accord with this aim. One of the most important among them is the resolution on preventing the arms race in space, which was drafted by the nonaligned countries with a consideration for the USSR proposal to develop international cooperation in the peaceful development of outer space under the conditions of its nonmilitarization and also of the relevant documents submitted by the PRC, Poland, and several other countries. The fact that 151 states voted for the resolution speaks for itself. Only the United States and Grenada did not support it. The United Nations has thus very clearly made a choice for peaceful space as a counterweight to the "star wars" plans.

The demand to put an end to nuclear tests and to conclude a corresponding international treaty was no less clearly expressed. The assembly welcomed the unilateral moratorium introduced by the USSR 6 August 1985 on all nuclear explosions as a real step toward achieving the above-mentioned goal. It urgently appealed to the other nuclear powers and above all, of course, the United States, to follow this example. The chance provided by the Soviet moratorium must not be let slip. The United States has every opportunity for responding to the aspirations of the people of the world expressed in this UN

decision -- to reach agreement with the Soviet Union on a joint moratorium on any nuclear explosions. The USSR is also prepared to embark here on far-reaching accords on questions of monitoring to which the U.S. representatives often refer. In particular it is in favor, when establishing a mutual moratorium now on nuclear explosions, of also reaching agreement with the United States on several measures for on-the-spot monitoring to eliminate possible doubts as to the observance of the moratorium. The monitoring problem thus cannot be regarded as an obstacle to reaching an agreement on a mutual moratorium. All that is needed to achieve it is political will and the readiness to respect the United Nations' opinion.

As a whole both the discussion which took place at the session and the main decisions taken at it express the international community's clear mandate: the renunciation of confrontation, and cooperation for the sake of peace on earth and in space. On this basis, which reflects planetary interests, the majority of the 159 states which are now UN members reached agreement.

This result fully accords with the aims which the socialist states set themselves in going to the forum. It was to a considerable extent the result of their vigorous, coordinated actions and the energetic new steps taken by the Soviet Union since the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum to achieve a real turn for the better in world affairs and to pave the way to the resurrection of detente as an essential state in forming a lasting system of world security and law and order. The actions by the Nonaligned Movement and the well-known initiatives of the leaders of six countries representing our planet's different contingents were an important factor in ensuring the session's positive results.

The session decided to proclaim 1986 the Year of Peace, which reflects the thrust of the peoples' hopes and aspirations for the new year. It was emphasized at the press conference that all peace-loving forces and all those prepared to consider the will of the international community in their policy are faced with the task of seeking to introduce to international relations the aims and principles of the United Nations and the decisions of the 40th UNGA session adopted on their bases.

Answers were given to journalists' questions.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1214

RELATED ISSUES

40TH UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY SESSION VIEWED BY PRAVDA

PM301439 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Dec 85 First Edition p 6

[Article by P. Vladimirov: "A Crucial Stage: The 40th UN General Assembly Session Demonstrated the Collective Will for Cooperation"]

[Excerpts] The 40th UN General Assembly session has basically ended. The forums of the world community are invariably noteworthy events, but this one was of special significance. This was because of the difficult and in many ways crucial nature of the current stage in international development. "Today," M.S. Gorbachev's message to the participants in the jubilee General Assembly session to mark the 40th anniversary of the United Nations said, "more than ever before, what is needed is joint efforts by the states and peoples to remove the threat of nuclear catastrophe from mankind."

For a Breakthrough in World Affairs

The Soviet Union's energetic new foreign policy steps were an important factor for positively influencing the international situation and ensuring constructive work, on the whole, by the session. Many participants in the assembly received as concrete manifestations of a responsible approach to world affairs the Soviet Union's imposition of a moratorium on all nuclear explosions, the halting of the siting of medium-range missiles in Europe and the removal from operational readiness of the SS-20 missiles additionally deployed in the European zone earlier, and the putting forward of proposals on preventing an arms race in space and ensuring its peaceful exploration and on radically reducing -- by 50 percent -- corresponding Soviet and U.S. nuclear arms. All this played a considerable part in ensuring that the atmosphere at the session was marked by a shift from the pessimism which prevailed in recent years to hope for a way out of the impasse created by the imperialist circles' policy of militarism and diktat.

From the General Assembly platform, the idea of the need for a decisive breakthrough for the better in world affairs rang out persistently. The UN members expressed the desire to promote such a breakthrough and make what contribution they could to achieving it. Welcoming the meeting between the USSR and U.S. leaders in Geneva, they often put forward ideas consonant with the Soviet approach to dialogue. Thus the assembly demonstrated the international community's awareness that the situation in the world is too dangerous to go on postponing practical measures to improve it. The session's most important decisions not only reflect the collective will to ensure a turn from confrontation to cooperation, but also outline ways of eliminating the threat of nuclear war. This result was to a considerable extent due to coordinated actions

by the socialist countries, including the peace initiatives jointly put forward in Sofia by the leaders of the Warsaw Pact states. Each fraternal country made its contribution to strengthening the positions of peace and socialism.

The GDR delegation played an important role in the elaboration of resolutions on a range of nuclear questions, including the appeal to all states with nuclear weapons to follow the example of the USSR and the PRC and pledge not to be the first to use such weapons. The Hungarian representatives worked actively on the resolution of the problem of ending nuclear tests. The Bulgarian delegation worked on questions of mobilizing public opinion in support of disarmament and the limitation of naval activity.

The session's decisions reflected Poland's proposal on studying the consequences of an arms race in space. The CSSR delegation developed the initiative on international cooperation in the disarmament sphere, and Mongolia on ensuring the peoples' right to peace.

In UN circles attention was drawn to the fact that the PRC delegation came out in a constructive vein on a whole series of questions, supporting the majority of decisions on questions of arms limitation. The nonaligned and neutral states and, on some issues, individual states allied with the United States adopted positions of realism and responsibility. There was a wide response for the proposals put forward by the leaders of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania, and Sweden on curbing the arms race, first and foremost the nuclear arms race, and preventing an arms race in space. "Let us cure the world of the madness of nuclear militarism," Indian Prime Minister R. Gandhi, chairman of the Nonaligned Movement, appealed in his speech at the session.

The assembly's attention was focused on the central problems of war and peace. This was promoted by the examination, on the USSR's proposal, of the question of international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space in conditions of non-militarization. As a counterweight to the sinister "star wars" plans, a "star peace" program was put before the international community -- a program of mutually advantageous cooperation, including the creation of a world space organization.

As a result a resolution was adopted, drawn up by the nonaligned states taking account of proposals from the USSR, the PRC, Poland, and a number of other countries, calling for the prevention of an arms race in space. Noting the need to refrain from actions contrary to this goal, the assembly answered, in essence, the attempts by the United States, as well as the FRG and Britain, to put the "star wars" plans beyond criticism. The resolution orients us toward the development of international cooperation in space. The fact that 151 states voted for it shows where the international community's will is directed. The United States, which abstained, accompanied only by the puppet Grenadian regime, found itself in isolation. The decisions adopted on disarmament problems basically reject the distorted logic whereby, in order to disarm, it is first necessary to arm yourself even more. They point to another path -- that of curbing the arms race, first and foremost the nuclear arms race, and preventing its spread to new spheres.

The Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions promoted the formulation of nuclear arms limitation questions in a more acute form than before. The assembly called on the other states possessing nuclear weapons to take a similar step and conclude a treaty banning all test explosions of these weapons. If the United States were to follow the USSR's

example, this would be an important stage on the path to the attainment of a goal mapped out in a number of resolutions of the assembly.

The desire to ensure measures in arms limitation and disarmament was reflected in the session's adoption of 71 resolutions, the majority of which name particular steps in this direction. The vast majority of UN members voted for them. It is indicative that the United States voted against 28 times, and on 6 of these occasions it was totally alone, and on 8 was in the company of representatives of 1 or 2 countries.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1214

RELATED ISSUES

PRAVDA REPORT ON ROMANIAN FOREIGN MINISTER'S VISIT TO USSR

PM281941 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Dec 85 First Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Romanian Foreign Minister's Visit to the USSR"]

[Excerpts] I. Vaduva, member of the RCP Central Committee and Romanian foreign minister, was on an official friendly visit to the Soviet Union 23-27 December 1985 at the invitation of the Soviet Government. I. Vaduva was received by N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, and I. Vaduva had talks on a broad range of questions of bilateral relations and international problems, which were held in an atmosphere of friendship, frankness, and mutual understanding.

In examining the situation in the world, the sides, noting the sharp intensification of international tension in recent years caused by imperialist policy, stressed that at the present time it is urgently necessary to pool the efforts of all states and peoples and all political and social forces to remove the threat of nuclear war, reduce the level of military confrontation, and develop international relations in the spirit of peaceful coexistence and detente. Noting the great importance of the Warsaw Pact states' Sofia statement, they expressed determination to strengthen the unity and cohesion of the fraternal socialist countries and to increase the effectiveness of their collaboration in the international arena.

The ministers stressed that the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan in Geneva creates more favorable opportunities for improving the overall atmosphere in the world and for returning to detente. The cardinal task of the day is to stop the arms race -- first and foremost the nuclear arms race -- to return to disarmament, to eradicate nuclear weapons on earth, and to prevent the militarization of space. Although it was not possible to resolve specific arms limitation and reduction problems in Geneva, the provisions contained in the joint statement on the impermissibility of nuclear war, the two sides' refusal to strive for military superiority, and the need to continue the political dialogue with a view to achieving positive shifts in international relations are of principled importance. The conviction was expressed that only practical and specific steps to implement the accords reached at Geneva can lead to a switch to real disarmament measures and the strengthening of universal peace. It is particularly important for the United States to join in the moratorium unilaterally announced by the Soviet Union on all nuclear explosions.

The ministers placed on record the definite progress at the Stockholm conference and stated the necessity to step up efforts to work out in the very near future substantial, mutually complementary confidence- and security-building measures in Europe of both a political and military nature. The sides advocated the creation of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the European continent, particularly in the Balkans and the north of Europe, and of a corridor free from nuclear weapons along the line separating the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries in Central Europe. They advocated the creation of chemical weapons-free zones in the Balkans and Central Europe as steps toward ridding the continent of those particularly dangerous weapons.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1214

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

28 January 1986